Political Awakening in KASHMIR

NARINDER SINGH

H. K. PUBLICATIONS
● Delhi ● Chandigarh

grad
JQ
620
.K35
S571
1992

First Published 1992

© Author 1992

Head Office:

H.K. Publications
A-1/11 Shakti Nagar Extension
Delhi 110 052
☎ 721 0979, 712 7025

Branch Office:

House No. 2522 Sector 22-C
Chandigarh - 160002

Laser Typeset by:

Sterling Laser Arts
C-100 Shakti Nagar Extension
Delhi 110 052
☎ 722 6129, 723 3929

Printed at :
D.K. Fine Art Press,
Delhi

GL
PL 480-5A
8-5-93

PREFACE

Every political system, in which citizens are enabled, in various measures, to participate in political processes, contains political parties. Their nature and arrangement are normally to be a key middle term in relation between society and politics. The party system is also shaped and coloured by the interests and ideas of groups in the society and in turn contributes significantly to the character of the whole political system. Since the relations are never merely in one direction, the total complex of political institutions influences the party system within it, as also the capacity of the party system to mould the social patterns. The political parties not only seek to bridge the gap between the people and their goals and ideas but also represent an essential link between the government and society through their effective media of communication. They are, thus, the lifeline of the modern politics.

But owing to peculiar situations in post-colonial new regimes, gearing in of politics with society, was delayed by foreign rule and hence, came late and suddenly and, often with severe jolts and much noise. The political parties in these newly developing political systems, which are not homogeneous but heterogeneous in character because of diversities of their customs, creeds, religions, languages and ethnic origins, are vital for aggregating the bulk of the interests within them and in providing structures of action whereby a high degree of accommodation and compromise can operate within these systems. They, therefore, appear as arteries of the body politics.

Unlike the west and very much like countries of the developing world, the growth of party system in British India was not extremely slow, considerably imperceptible and gradual a process. It grew as a reaction and a negative concept: to be rid of foreign rule.

Even though the written constitution of free India, like many other written constitutions of the world, does not acknowledge the existence of political parties, yet they are central to our political process. As political parties seek national goals, nominate candidates for national office, help

in their elections, seek to influence the elected officials in the implementation of national programmes, the only means whereby power can be obtained and exercised in an organised way and give meaning to representative system in contemporary India, they are not only necessary but inevitable.

Moreover, for the political system to operate successfully in a pluralistic society like India, which is criss-crossed by many cleavages, and thus very much like other Afro-Asian societies, right and left wing extremism as well as political parties are bound to come into existence in order to bring out the healthy articulation, aggregation and accommodation of diverse political interests and public opinion.

Viewing in this perspective, this analysis of the "Party politics in Jammu and Kashmir - a study of the rightist parties," which is a subsystem of the Indian political system, is in the nature of a micro-study of a political phenomenon widely prevalent in the developing societies.

The main thrust of the study is towards an informed and objective discussion of the rightist parties in the state. An attempt has been made to bring into its fold the scattered but necessary and relevant material related to the working of the rightist parties in order to study the problem in its right perspective. Since the material concerning the present problem has been given peripheral touch by various writers, an attempt in the present work has been undertaken to give a comprehensive and realistic touch. In addition, the present work aims at a critical discussion of the rightist parties in view of their growing influence. It also seeks to study the basis and dynamics of the rightist parties and examines their nature, origin and impact on the functioning of modern democracies.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

An endeavour to effect a working relationship, a suitable fusion of the 'historical' and 'behavioural' approaches has been made in this study.

The historical aspect has been covered with the help of the study and interpretation of the correspondence between the leaders of these parties, the representations made to the Maharaja and his replies thereof, the gazettes of the Jammu and Kashmir state, the original documents and pamphlets published by the parties as well as by the Kashmir government or government of India from time to time; papers, letters, protest notes, party resolutions, election manifestos and other relevant

material from the archives of the different political organisations which were involved in the politics of the state; local, national as well as the foreign newspapers and the books published in India and abroad.

The behavioural side has been approached and tackled on the basis of empirical investigations. It has been based upon personal interviews covering a substantial part of the total universe i.e. the top political personalities of the rightist political parties in the state. The interviews have been conducted on the basis of a structured questionnaire which may reasonably be expected to give first hand knowledge as well as throw a good light on the different aspects of the growth and inside working of the rightist parties in the state and their impact, on the regional, state and national politics.

The schedule of questions begins with sample factual inquiry about the respondents' personal background and moves towards more complex ones covering respondents' political career. Some questions are also designed to probe and elicit replies pertaining to the issues and controversies confronted from time to time but the answers of which are not found in the published material including books.

In the quest of knowing more about the intricacies of the working of the rightist politics in the state and its impact on national politics in general and local, and regional politics of the state in particular, opportunity of interviewing some of the outstanding political personalities in the state has also been availed of. Although they were not members of these parties yet they were either connected with them by one way or the other and thus had exercised some impact on their working or atleast witnessed the political events in the past from close quarters.

THE PLAN OF STUDY

The main body of this study is comprised of five Chapters alongwith introduction, tables, annexures to support the analysis and findings.

Chapter - I entitled, "Importance of Political Parties in a Democracy" takes into account the nature, concept and the importance of political parties in modern democracies. An attempt has been made to analyse the various definitions of political parties highlighting and hopefully illuminating some major complexities regarding the nature of political parties, their origin and functioning. In addition to it, the growth and development of political parties have also been discussed. The later part of the Chapter exclusively deals with the importance of political

parties in modern democracies, and it has been summed up that political parties are more or less synonimous with modern democracies.

Chapter - II entitled, "Growth of Party Politics in the State of Jammu & Kashmir and the Social relevance of Political Parties," attempts to present a comprehensive discussion about the geographical and historical events that resulted in the political awakening among the masses of the state. A panoramic view of the social, economic and political conditions of the people under successive regimes has also been given. It has been observed that up to the end of 19th century political consciousness was at the lowest ebb due to oppressive attitude of the autocratic rulers. The increasing literacy rate and influence of the mass media which entered the state from across the border gave a new turn to the politics of the state. People became conscious of their political rights in view of the sharp rise of political momentum taking place in the neighbouring states like Punjab. The people of Jammu gave a lead and formed a socio-political organisation named Dogra Sabha. This organization though unacceptable to the people of the valley was instrumental in giving them an impetus to form an organisation of their own. Several other factors like the spread of education among the people of valley and their contact with the leaders of the Indian National movement further brought political consciousness among them. They, therefore, formed an organized group - "The Reading Room" and started pressuring the government to give more representation to the unemployed Muslim youth in the government services. After some time the leaders of the Reading Room realised that government jobs for the educated muslim youth was not their real objective. Realization of this fact made them to intensify the struggle for political emancipation, The, then ruler Maharaja Hari Singh saw the writing on the wall and ordered the formation of Glency Commission which recommended the grant of political rights to the toiling masses. This development led to the emergence of the first political party, the all Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference which spearheaded the freedom movement in the state of Jammu and Kashmir and made possible the ouster of autocratic rule in less than two decades' time.

Chapter - III entitled, "Growth of Rightist Parties" - a reaction to the nationalist forces, presents an exhaustive discussion, abut the meaning and concept of 'Right'. In order to arrive at the true meaning of 'Right', the concept of 'Left' is also taken up in detail. Party systems of

contemporary political systems like Great Britain, America, France and Soviet Russia were thoroughly evaluated to find out the true meanings of Right and Left. In the light of the Right and Left controversy in the Western democracies and Soviet Russia an attempt was made to find out true rightist parties at work from time to time in India. During the course of this endeavour it was found that meaning of Right and Left in the Indian context differs to a large extent from other countries where parties are branded as Rightist or Leftist on ideological grounds. The Indian parties are not strictly divided on ideological lines. Some Indian parties are called rightist because they preach fundamentalism and are associated with one religion or the other. Even communist parties having left leanings have in their ranks groups having right leanings. Some true rightist parties like Bhartiya Janta Party refuse to accept the title of Right for themselves.

After a careful study of the working of political parties in India it was observed that Muslim League and Hindu Mahasabha were the true rightist parties in the pre-independence days. After independence different rightist parties at work on the Indian political scene have been Bharatiya Jan Sangh, Ram Rajya Parishad and the Indian Union Muslim League. In the later part of the chapter a short analysis of the different Rightist Parties at work in the State of Jammu and Kashmir was undertaken.

The Chapter - IV examines in detail the origin and development of the rightist parties like the Muslim Conference, Praja Parishad, Plebiscite Front, Awami Action Committee Jamat-e-Islamia, Jan Sangh and Bharatiya Janta Party which were at work on the political horizon of the state from time to time. A wide coverage is given to the Muslim Conference because of its role in the freedom struggle. It was observed during the course of its study that it was exclusively a Muslim party in the beginning and fought for the rights of the Muslim alone. Due coverage was given to the various agitations launched by this party and its conversion into the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference in 1939. New Muslim Conference formed by C. Ghulam Abbas and others also finds a place in this Chapter. Events leading to the formation of other rightist parties, their development and working have been fully taken into view. In addition to it exhaustive field survey has been undertaken to collect party resolutions, election manifestos and their constitutions. It has been analysed that the growth of rightist parties of Jammu was the direct outcome of the genesis, growth and development of the rightist

parties of the Kashmir valley. For example, Muslim Conference - National Conference failed to make inroads in the Hindu dominated Jammu region. Birth of Praja Parshid in Jammu was an expression of sentiments of the Jammu people. It is worthwhile to note that while the rightist parties of the valley have an anti-Indian and secessionist stance, those of the Jammu province have always stood for the full and final integration of the state with the Indian union. A wide coverage has been given to the policies, programmes and support bases of the Rightist Parties in the state. In addition, their electoral performance from 1952 to 1987 have also been evaluated.

Chapter V examines, in detail, the working of rightist opposition in the state of Jammu and Kashmir both inside and outside the legislature. And it has been observed that the rightist parties before independence influenced the political process mostly from outside the legislature but after independence, except for a brief period, it influenced the politics of the state from inside the legislatures besides its constructive role from outside. The stands taken by the rightist parties on different issues have been given due coverage. Statements given by different leaders of the opposition both inside and outside the legislature also find a place in this chapter.

Chapter - VI contains the brief summary of our observations and suggestions during the course of study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

It is my privilege to have worked for my Ph.D thesis on the topic entitled 'Party Politics in the State of Jammu & Kashmir' (A case Study of the Rightist Parties) under the supervision of Dr. Vidya Bhushan, Reader and Head, Post-graduate Department of Political Science, University of Jammu. Dr. Vidya Bhushan, a distinguished scholar on the subject, has been a constant source of my inspiration, providing me his valuable guidance on the subject. I express my profound gratitude to Dr. Bhushan without whose valuable comments on different aspects of political parties in general and the rightist parties in Jammu & Kashmir state in particular, it would not have been possible for me to make the study up to date.

I am extremely grateful to all political leaders, legislators, members of parliament, journalists and other respondents who have obliged me in recording their interviews and thus throwing sufficient light on some of the most important controversies and issues in the dynamics of Kashmir politics, the answers of which could not be found in the published books and journals.

I am extremely thankful to Dr. Dushyant Rampal, Professor and Head of the Department of English, University of Jammu, Prof. B. N. Thussu and Dr. Sukhdev Singh, Sr. Lecturer of English, M.A.M. College, Jammu who were kind enough to go through my manuscript.

I am also grateful to Dr. R.S. Didwal, the Principal and other esteemed colleagues in my college for their immensely encouraging cooperations and inspirations during the course of my studies.

My thanks are also due to Dr. Yog Raj Sharma with whom I had friendly exortation on my topic from time to time. I also express my gratitudes to Shri Har Dev Singh, Librarian of the Department of Political Science for arranging books for my consultation.

I express my sincerest gratitude to my revered father S. Bhagat Singh who very affectionately inspired me to take up my Ph.D project and

without whose blessings the study would not have been completed. I also thank my wife Inderjit, who undertook household responsibilities during the period of my research. It is her immensely encouraging co-operation that has enabled me to complete the work in time. I am also thankful to my son Harbinder Pal Singh and daughters Puneet and Jasneet for taking a keen interest in my project.

I shall fail in my duty if I do not thank S. Gurdev Singh Suden who very carefully typed out the final scripts of the thesis.

NARINDER SINGH

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	5
I.	IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN A DEMOCRACY	17
II.	GROWTH OF PARTY POLITICS IN THE STATE OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR AND THE SOCIAL RELEVANCE OF POLITICAL PARTIES.	27
III.	GROWTH OF RIGHTIST PARTIES -- A REACTION TO THE NATIONALIST FORCES.	47
IV.	A STUDY OF RIGHTIST PARTIES	65
	a) Muslim Conference	
	b) Praja Parshid	
	c) Awami Action Committee	
	d) Plebiscite Front	
	e) Jammat-e-Islami	
	f) Jan Sangh	
	g) Bharatiya Janta Party	
V.	ROLE OF RIGHTIST PARTIES AS OPPOSITION BOTH INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE LEGISLATURE	119
VI.	CONCLUSION	179
VII.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	189

LIST OF TABLES

I. Factors and Forces which led to the formation of Reading Room Group in the Valley of Kashmir.

II. Groups which connected into the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference.

III. Factors which led to the Political Awakening and Organisation of Political Parties in the State.

IV. Reasons for Branding Certain Parties as Rightist

V. Parties in India which can be termed as Rightist

VI. Political Personalities who influenced Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah for converting Muslim Conference into National Conference.

VII. Reasons for opposition to the move to convert Muslim Conference into National Conference.

VIII. Factors which compelled Jammat-e-Islami to join Muslim Unit Front.

IX. Electoral Performance of Jamaat-e-Islami.

X. Reasons for the popularity of Plebiscite Front

XI. Main Objectives of Awami Action Committee.

XII. Elements which comprised Praja Parshid.

XIII. Reasons for the failure of Praja Parshid to establish foothold in the Muslim dominated areas.

XIV. Electoral Performance of Praja Parshid

XV. Electoral Performance of Bharatiya Jan Sangh.

XVI. Electoral Performance of Bharatiya Janta Party

XVI. View Points of various Rightist Parties on the Accession Issue.

XVII. The Party position and the Percentage of Votes Polled in the 1983 Assembly Elections.

1

IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN A DEMOCRACY

IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN A DEMOCRACY

Political activity in a democratic polity, to a considerable extent, is the activity of political parties. They represent not only the dynamics of social life but are also the means by which classes, regions, ethnic and other groups, seek to achieve their objectives. They have become the means for broad national consensus on the basic issues confronting a nation and also give expression to divisions and dissensions, conflicts and crises within the body politics.[1]

As democracy is the government of the people and for the people, the party system, which represents the opinion of the people, or a large section of the people, forms not merely an inseparable part of it but has become its life line.[2] It is the back-bone of every representative government because each party tries to get its own leaders into office and for that purpose it educates the masses and moulds public opinion in its favour. A democratic system, is, in fact, unthinkable except in terms of modern political parties.[3]

Since every representative government requires leaders, the leaders too require not an incoherent mob behind them, but an organised following able to canalise opinion through political controversies and to exercise their choice freely.[4] The political parties not only give leaders to a nation, bring the large number of voters within their ranks, organise them locally, hold together the other politically like-minded persons, present before them their programmes in a clear cut form, provide them sufficient literature, but also stir them out of their apathy, remind them of their duty to vote and thus keep a nation's life alive.[5] As each political party has a large political organisation which works around the year with control over its local branches, the party system largely controls the administrative system as well. The cumulative effect of all this is the intense political activity to educate the voters and to arouse the political consciousness among them.

The political parties reflect the excitement and dynamism of man's political experience, give life to otherwise stagnated formal institutions of government in a society,[6] serve as a link between the masses and the government and present the main moving force between the government and the society. They are, therefore, one of the most salient and universal

features of political life in the twentieth century. Industrialisation, urbanisation, development of science and technology, increase in literacy level etc. contribute towards the growth of a new society - a society which is more complex and full of challenges. Such challenges lead to the emergence of new ideas, new values and new groups in society. Social relations change with the change in the mode of production, exchange and distribution. Therefore, whenever the political system reaches a certain degree of complexity or whenever the notion of political power comes to include the idea that the public must participate in the decision making process, the importance of political parties becomes inevitable.

Historically speaking, parties were born when large number of people really made their entrance into political life. They have, therefore, provided the necessary framework enabling the masses to recruit from themselves their own elites. The classic protest against parties' interference in political life and the domination exercised by militants over deputies, committees over parliament, has accentuated the formal character of ministries as well as the parliaments.[7] There was a time when the parties were exclusively the instruments of private, financial and economic interests. These interests have now become the instruments in the hands of the political parties. Among them the place of mass parties is becoming increasingly important. This transformation represents an advance of democracy and not a retreat. Democracy, as such, is not threatened by the party regimes but by present day trends in the party's internal organisation. The danger does not lie in the existence of parties but in the military, religious and totalitarian form they sometime assume.[8]

Democratic government, however, have a pyramidical structures with wide bases and narrow tops. It, therefore, became imperative in a democratic political system that a continuous relationship be established between the leaders at the top and the followers at the base level. As the political parties play an important role and work for the establishment and enhancement of political relationship between them, they are vital for the successful working of a democratic system. They provide mobility as well as stability to a political system.[9] In other words, in a democratic political system where party system is not so developed, several crises crop up which threaten the stability of the system itself.

Since society is characterised by continuity, change, development and decay, political parties also act as the agencies of goal attainment.[10]

The present issues, set values and goals for the society, and serve as the brokers of ideas by selecting, a certain number out of the countless issues confronting a society in some order of priority and focus attention on them from time to time.[11] They, thus adjust themselves to the factors like geography, culture and economy and thereby acquire the capacity and capability to face the crisis of legitimacy, identity, penetration, participation, integration and distribution that a political system may face at different times.

The political parties also seek to inculcate values, norms and orientations into the minds of individuals so that they not only develop trust in their respective political system but become involved, to varying degree, in its politics. They, therefore, serve as one of the major agents of the political socialisation of the citizens.[12] In other words, the political parties inculcate the norms, values, beliefs, attitudes and pattern of behaviour that will enable the masses to participate in the political process of the system and thus provide stability to it. They are potentially capable of involving large number of people in political action on a sustained and controlled basis.[13]

Moreover, as the political parties establish a healthy rapport with the masses, to balance their interests with the values and norms of the society, they act as the agencies of interest articulation in a political system.[14] The concept of interest articulation presuppose the existence and working of organised groups with specific interests of their own in a democratic society.

The political parties have not only to articulate the interests of the various sections of a society, but also to aggregate and accommodate them in such a manner that the danger of imbalance and instability of the political system should not arise at all.[15] Through all media of communication, they attempt to bridge the gap between the people and their goals and ideals. In order to achieve their fundamental aim of having victory at polls, they enlist and groom candidates for elections from time to time. A political party as such can be equalised to a miniature political system.

They also contribute towards the development of political process by solving the problems created by the process of modernisation and development. They too serve as major agent of nation-building and national integration.[16] Political parties are, therefore, general phenomena in a democratic political system whether they are in the category of

developed or developing nations. They are, therefore, one of the most effective instruments in bringing about desirable changes in a political system.

The political parties also unite, simplify and stabilize the political processes. They bring together sectional interests, overcome geographical distances and provide coherence to sometime divisive governmental structures. They, therefore, act as one of the agencies of pattern maintenance of a political system. As such they strive to shape the government, provide the main link among the different social and economic groups, constitute the chief agency for political socialization, break down traditional behaviour and act as the binding force in the heterogenous societies.[17]

They too work for the alleviation of the sufferings of masses during the days of famine, drought, epidemic and war etc.[18] They even keep a nation's mind alive, as the rise and fall of the sweeping tides freshen water of the vast ocean inlets.[19]

The political parties create as well as represent public opinion. In other words, the party system is not only the reflection of public opinion but also the result of external technical factors which are imposed upon opinion.[20] Without parties there will be only vague, instinctive, varying tendencies dependent on character, education habit, social position and so on. That is to say that public opinions might be vague and ineffective if the party searchlight was not constantly turned on. Even the Marxist theory holds that all classes are class conscious, but class consciousness does not exist unless a party exists to awaken and develop it. The parties, therefore, give precision to individual opinion and enrich, develop and strengthen it. We may say that political parties by giving a skeletal articulation to a shapeless, jelly-like mass, crystallize and stabilize public opinion. Without them public opinion is versatile, changeable and fickle. They cause similar opinion to coagulate and minimise individual differences and smooth down personal idiosyncrasies to mould them into a few great spiritual families.[21] The work of synthesis is not the least important side of party activity. For it alone make possible the existence of elections and some form of political representation since both remain, impossible in the inextricable velter of individual attitudes.

The development of parties has also brought about a profound transformation in the structure of political regimes. Just as contemporary

dictatorship, based on a single party, bears only a remote resemblance to personal or military tyrannies, the modern democracies, based on a system of several organised and disciplined parties, are very different from the individual regimes of the nineteenth century which depended on personal inter-play of members of parliament who were independent of each other.

Moreover, the existence of a party of opposition with a programme, fairly within the limits of a possible public opinion, is a bullwork against the tyranny not only of a despot but also against a practical political majority.

As the simplest and the most realistic definition of democracy is that it is a regime in which those who govern are chosen by those who are governed by means of free and open elections,[22] and the parliament, mandatory of the nation is expression of a national sovereignity. The development of parties has brought about great changes in the electoral process also. There is no longer a dialogue between the electors and the representatives, the nation and the parliament; parties have come between them. They have radically modified the nature of their relationship. Before being chosen by the electors, the deputy is chosen by the party and the elections only ratify this choice.[23] The party mandate thus seems to carry more weightage than that of the electors.

Political parties not only play an essential part in the first phase of electoral operation - the nomination of candidates, but they are also not absent from the second, choice between the candidates, that is, the election proper. In the first place they exert on it a direct and vital influence by supporting the candidate in this election campaign.[24] Thus, although chosen by the party, the deputies are submitted to the popular vote for which a grand parade of propaganda and ceremony is undertaken. All this is done by the political parties. In short, the party system has made the elections easy and possible and has also helped in legislative excellence.

Since parliament and government are like two machines driven by the same motor - the party, it becomes the means of ensuring the domination of the parliament by the government. The latter is controlled by the party leaders, whose subordinates are deputies who form the majority in parliament.[25] Even inside the government party solidarity becomes reinforced and thus the cementing force of ministerial solidarity. In relation between the cabinet and the house, the authority of

the party leaders over the elected representatives establishes the subordination of the parliament by the government.

The political parties, thus, help to ensure the stability of political system by serving as useful instruments of political socialization and education and by providing citizens with the means of registering their grievances and preferences. They institutionalise popular participation, observe dissent and reduce strain on the system.

The rise of party system has also made possible real and active participation and cooperation by the entire population in the political affairs. They first provide organization of masses and then enable them gradually to acquire some political training. It is the party system alone which makes it possible to form a new ruling class springing from the people to replace the old one. In other words, the greatest significance of political parties, in the contemporary democracies is that they alone tend to create the new elites in the society,[26] and thus restore the notion of representation in the true sense. As all the governments are by nature oligarchies, the origin and the training of oligarchies will determine their actions; a regime without parties, on the other hand ensures the permanence of ruling elites either by birth or wealth or position. It is, therefore, conservative in character and corresponds to the property franchise and attempts to cripple universal sufferage by imposing on the people the leaders who do not come from their rank. To secure admission to the government oligarchy, a man of the people must accomplish a considerable effort to rise above his initial position. He must also work his way up the ladders of middle class education and may lose contact, with the class in which he was born.

The party system also avoids the risk of direct legislation. If parties always distort public opinion, to some degree they also prevent the still larger distortion caused by sudden waves of excitement. The party organizations are, therefore, mostly inclined to check political vagaries.

While summing up, I may say that the successful prosecution of democracy demands a successful party system. Far from being in conflict with the theory of democratic government, the party system is the only apparatus which renders the latter feasible. A modern democratic state without this somewhat artificial and yet essential unanimity, would become a brawling choas of public opinion.

FOOT NOTES

1. *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences,* Macmillan Company and Free Press; USA; 1968, pp. 436-62.
2. Laski, H.J.: *Parliamentary Government in England,* Oxford University Press, 1967, p.71
3. Singh, Balbir : *State Politics in India* Macmillan India, Delhi, 1982, p. 44.
4. Asthana, Pushpa : *Party System in India - Development and Decay* New Delhi, Criterion Publication, 1988, p. 155.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Rose, Richard : *The Problems of Party Government,* London, Macmillan, 1975, p. 133.
7. Robertson, David : *The Theory of Party Competition,* New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1976, p. 181.
8. Laski, H.J.: *A Grammar of Politics,* London, George Allen & Unwin, 1977, p. 31.
9. Santori, Giovanni : *Parties and Party System,* London, Cambridge University Press, 1976, p. 173.
10. Hinderson, G.G.: *Introduction of Political Parties,* New York, Rose and Row, 1976, 1976, p. 36.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Political Socialization is the process by which political culture are maintained and changed.
13. Almond, Gabriel : *Comparative Politics,* Powell, Bingham, New Delhi, Amerind Publishing Co. p. 120.
14. Interests articulation refers to the process by which individuals and groups make demands on the political decision makers.
15. Curtis, Michael : *Comparative Government and Politics,* London, Harper & Row Publishers, 1978, p.158.
16. Elderveld, S.J. : *Political Parties: A Behavioral Analysis,* Chicago, 1964, p.170.
17. Castels, E.G.: *The Impact of Politics,* London, Sage Publications, 1982, p.139.
18. Weiner, M. La Palombra : *Political Parties and Political Development,* U.S.A., Princeton University Press, 1972, p.73.
19. Munro, D.J.: *The Government of United States* U.S.A., Chicago Press, 1951, p. 113.
20. Duverger, Maurice : *Political Parties,* London, Metheun & Co. Ltd., 1964, p.1.
21. Sartori, Giovanni : op. cit., p. 217
22. Ware, Allen : *The Logic of Party Democracy,* London, Macmillan, 1979, p. 143.
23. Maisel, Louis: *Political Parties : Development or Decay,* London, Sage Publications, 1977, p. 153.
24. Duverger, Maurice, *op. cit.,* p.364.
25. *Ibid.,* p. 403
26. Robertson, David, *op. cit.,* P.181

2

GROWTH OF PARTY POLITICS IN THE STATE OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR AND THE SOCIAL RELEVANCE OF POLITICAL PARTIES

GROWTH OF PARTY POLITICS IN THE STATE OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR AND THE SOCIAL RELEVANCE OF POLITICAL PARTIES

The celebrated valley of Kashmir, nestled securely among the Himalayas at an average height of 6,000 feet above the sea, is approximately 84 miles in length and 20 to 25 miles in breadth. Although remote and isolated, the valley became a prized object of conquest for ambitious rulers of the neighbouring kingdoms. It was also vulnerable to periodic occupation because of its position close to the major overland routes between central Asia and the Indian Peninsula[1]. In the last four hundred years, the valley saw the rise and fall of numerous dynasties, including Moghuls, Afghans, Sikhs and, most recently, Dogras[2]. The rulers, or in many cases, their governors and representatives, tended not only to neglect the welfare of the Kashmiris but to pursue a conscious policy of persecution and exploitation.

The most oppressive period, by all accounts, was the period of years following the Afghan Seizure of the Valley from the Mughals in 1752. Under Afghan despotism the people of Kashmir were oppressed by a succession of governors from Kabul, each, more cruel than his predecessor. Their rapacity was inflicted on the people irrespective of religion or caste and Hindus and Muslims were alike the victims of their cruel rule[3]. Kashmir had been so much trodden down that Afghan governors could hold the province with only a small force[4]. In short, the people of the Valley of Kashmir were so exploited and abused that they were reduced to an abject state of submissiveness[5].

The sikhs who succeeded the Afghans were not so barbarically cruel, but they were hard and tough masters.[6] Despite some initial optimism, the advent of Sikh hegemony in 1819 failed to make a new era of enlightenment and progress. The affairs of the province were sadly neglected by reckless governors under the sikh rule[7]. The plight of people, especially the large mass of Muslims, continued to be one of desperate and demoralizing proportions. In describing the conditions under the sikhs in 1922, William Moorecroft, the first English traveller to visit the Valley, wrote: "Everywhere, the people are in the most abject conditions, exorbitantly taxed by the sikh government, and subject to every kind of extortions and oppression by its officers".[8]

While Kashmir was passing through the vicissitudes in its history, a new power was growing in influence on the environs of the valley. This was the authority of the dogra prince, Gulab Singh one of Maharaja Ranjit Singh's favourite lieutenants created Raja of Jammu in 1820 for the services rendered to the sikh cause. Gulab Singh, by force of character, speedily organised his territory on firm lines and eventually established a complete dominance over nearly all the regions between Kashmir and Punjab. Ladakh and Baltistan were also brought under his control. As a result he was practically the master of all the territory immediately surrounding the Valley of Kashmir.[9]

During war between the Britain and the sikhs, Gulab Singh refrained from taking sides, and, in 1846, after the battle of Sobraon, he acted as a mediator between the belligerents. The treaties thus concluded gave to the British, as equivalent of an indemnity of ten million rupees, the hilly area between the rivers Beas and Indus. Out of this ceded territory, the British, under the Treaty of Amritsar, transferred to Gulab Singh, for the sum of seven and half million rupees, all the hilly and mountainous area situated to the East of the Indus and the west of the Ravi which included the Valley of Kashmir.[10] It was thus towards the end of the 19th century that the state of Jammu & Kashmir came into shape. The authority of the Maharaja was extended from Chitral in the north to Kathua in south and Akbaichin in the east to Kohala in the west. The state therefore, became the most important frontier region of India.

The Jammu and Kashmir State as it exists today is the creation of Mahraja Gulab Singh. Mr. K.M. Panikar has rightly remarked: "In a century barren of historical achievements in India, Gulab Singh stands out as a solitary figure of political eminence....He is the only ruler in India's long history who could be said to have extended the geographical boundries of India.....No previous Indian ruler, not even Samandra Gupta or Akbar, had even dreamt of invading Tibet. The Maharaja's forces routed the Tibetan army and extended the border of India to the other side of the Humalayas".[11] One of the unintended results of the valley's inclusion in the Dogra rule was that Kashmiris became tied up with a substantially larger and more diverse political unit.

Conditions prevailing in Kashmir, when Gulab Singh took over, were deplorable. The sikh rule had failed to bring any economic prosperity to the poor people.[12] But the establishment of Dogra rule was not without its unpleasant drawbacks for the people of the valley of

Kashmir. The first fifty years of Dogra rule were responsible for disseminating in the minds of its subjects the seeds of resentment against its very existence.[13] The Dogra authorities continued to treat the Kashmiris with much the same contempt as their Mughal, Afghan and sikh predecessors. Gulab Singh laid the foundation of a centralised government "in which the authority of the ruler was assured by force and the revenue came punctually.[14] Indeed, there were even new abuses to be shouldered, such as the imposition of the notorious 'begar' a form of forced labour.[15] Begar was so harshly enforced that the very word was a constant terror for the poor in Kashmir.[16]

It will be recalled that the ruling family was Hindu, while the vast majority of the Valley's population was Muslim. The Dogras regarded the people of Kashmir as a subject race.[17] In addition to discrimination based upon religious differences,[18] there was evidence of a strong regional bias in the attitude and actions of Dogras administration. An example of the latter was the former Maharaja Ranbir Singh's land reform programme introduced in 1877 which extended benefits of land ownership to tenants in the province of Jammu but not to those in the valley of Kashmir and the frontier regions.[19] A second illustration was the exclusion of all Kashmiris; Hindus as well as Muslims, from the military service.[20]

The scene of the greatest suffering was not, of course, the few members of the Muslim elite deprived of employment in the state's services. It was the Kashmiri Muslim peasantry that found itself shouldering the heaviest burdens of the state government's unfair policies.[21] Dressed in rags which could hardly hide his body and bare foot, a Muslim peasant presented the appearance rather of a starving beggar than of one who filled the coffers of the state.[22] As a rule, the Muslim tenant laboured in the fields during the six warmest months of the year to pay taxes to the state, rental to the proprietor, interest to the money lender, and graft to the local officials. He often ended up with less than enough to feed his family and was forced to earn what he could by other means.[23] Many, who went outside the valley in search of work, died at unknown places, uncared and unwept.[24]

The treatment of the Kashmiris reflected the contempt with which they were regarded by the members of the Dogra administration. Their docile and yielding manner served to accentuate this contempt. The inhabitants of the valley were held in such a low esteem that their name

became a term of insult and abuse. To call a man a "Kashmiri" seemed to indicate that he was cowardly, ignorant, deceitful and completely devoid of self respect.[25]

In 1877, a memorandum was secretly submitted to the Viceroy which contained grave allegations against the Dogra administration such as misgovernment and maladministration. One of the allegations was that boat loads of starving people were drowned in Wular lake to relieve food shortage. The fate of the memorandum was, however,not known. The conditions of the people of the valley continued to be the same.[26] A great luminary of modern Islam and a man of Kashmir origin, commented upon the dismal plight of Kashmiris by saying, "The Kashmiri hug slavery to his bossom and was a stranger to the dignity of self, ashamed of his ego".[27]

It was in this atmosphere of suffering that the valley entered the 20th century. Upto this time, there was no political awakening or political activity of any kind. But things soon started happening under the cloud of autocratic rule. In the face of peculiar socio-political conditions, the first political organization made its debut in Jammu in 1904 under a special permission.[28] The name of this organization was Dogra Sabha and it was headed by Hans Raj Mahajan. The Dogra Sabha had a limited programme of social reforms. It was liberal in outlook and non-communal in character[29] as both the Hindus and the Muslims joined it. Its activities, however, were mainly confined to the politics of petition and prayer, having fully accepted the monarchial institutions as the focal point and the linchpin of the political process. Its complete identification with peculiar Dogra nationalism and Dogra rule and its power structure made it unacceptable to the people of Kashmir at large.[30]

In the first decade of this century two degree colleges - one in Jammu and the other in Srinagar were established for imparting the western type of education as was then prevalent in British India. This was some what preceded and accompanied by similar move at the level of Primary and Secondary education. Within a generation, an educated elite, both in Kashmir valley and Jammu came into existence, asking for jobs and insisting that Kashmir was for Kashmiris. The interpretation was obvious. The officials and other government employees brought from British India, particularly from Punjab, be sent back and no more outsiders be taken in the State administration.[31]

The growth of national movement in British India cast its impact on the people of princely states in India. Thus the people of the state of Jammu and Kashmir were completely isolated and immunizsed to the national movement and its manifold repercussion.[32]

In 1907, the students of government school Jammu organized a student movement. Some of them shouted "Bande Mataram" in the streets of Jammu and wrote slogans on the walls of the school. Consequently, the state authorities expelled four students and dismissed two teachers from service. Raja Amar singh took a serious view of the incident and directed the District Magistrate and the police, "to keep close watch over all agitations and to adopt measures consistent with the situation to prevent and put a stop to politically dangerous movements.[33]

The non-cooperation and Satyagrah movements launched by the congress under the leadership of Mahatama Gandhi greatly inspired the people in the Jammu region and made them conscious of the ideals of freedom and self rule. In the Prince of Wales College (now G.G.M. Science College) Jammu the students went on strike following the expulsion of a student from the college by the Principal, an Englishman. Subsequently over 150 students went to Gujranwala to attend a conference of students convened by Lala Lajpat Rai to induce the students to join the non-cooperation movement. Due to the personal intervention of the Maharaja, the situation did not assume serious proportions as it had at one stage threatened to do.[34]

In 1916-17, Summander Khan applied to Maharaja Pratap Singh for the permission to set up a non-political Muslim Association.[35] On the grant of permission in 1921, a society known as Anjuman-e-Islamia was formed in Jammu to look after the education and social welfare of the Muslims.[36] With the passage of time, a group of the youth tried to broaden its sphere of activity but it was opposed and resented by the elderly members.

In the Kashmir valley there was apparent calm but occasionally there was a rumbling on the political horizon.[37] In 1924, the inadequately paid labourers of the Silk Factory rose in rebellion.[38] They assembled in Hazuri Bagh in defiance of the ban imposed on the assembly of people. They were dispersed by cavalry regiment of the Maharaja. Their leaders were arrested, tried and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. Simultaneous disturbance at Anantnag was also quietened.[39]

Another serious incident took place in the same year. The Shia community took out Tazia procession. They altered the traditional route of the procession, where upon superintendent of Police carried away the Tazia under the orders of the Governor, thus denying them the right to observe a highly emotional religious function. It was condemned by all sections of Muslims including Khawaja Saad-ud-Din Shaukat, a businessman by profession with great political foresight whom Mohammad Yusuf Saraf called the father of modern political movement in Kashmir.[40] The Muslims of Kashmir were thus a frustrated community and when the Viceroy, Lord Reading visited the state, some of the leading members of the community submitted a memorandum to him demanding the grant of properietory rights in land to peasants,[41] a large representation of Muslims in government service, improvement in the conditions of Mohammadan education in the state, abolition of Begar in all its aspects; constitution of elected Assembly and restoration of Mosques in possession of the government. The memorandum signed by Khawaja Saad-ud-Din Shawl, Khawaja Hassan Shah Naqshbandi, Mir Waiz Kashmir Maulvi Ahmadullah, Mirwaiz Hamadami, Agaha Syed Hussain Shah Jalali, Mufti Sharif-ud-Din and Khawaja Hassan Shah Mehandi etc. The memorandum was forwarded to Maharaja for necessary action. The majaraja appointed a three member committee to investigate the grievances. The committee exonerated the Dogra government by dismissing the charges of the memorandum as unproved and unture. As a result, Khawaja Saad-ud-Din Shawl was externed from the state, Khawaja Hassan Shah Naqashbandi lost his Jagir, Hassan Shah Jalali was dismissed from the office of zaildar and others were administered warnings.[42]

The period between 1925 and 1930 witnessed the dawn of political awakening in Kashmir. A number of factors combined to arouse the masses out of their political apathy and intertia, for which they had paid heavy price in the past.[43] Maharaja Hari Singh ascended the throne in 1925 after the death of Partap Singh. He made a bright start. Due to the effective intervention of the British India Government, a series of reforms were underway, and the people had started looking forward. [44] Partap Singh had abolished the marriage tax which was imposed on the muslims only, but discriminations against them were still too many. A maximum sentence of ten years of imprisonment awaited those who slaughtered cows which were sacred to Hindus, and therefore, to the state because the ruler was a Hindu.[45] The law of inheritence would

deprive anybody of his inherited property if he was stupid enough to change his religion. For a proselytizing creed like Islam, this was sufficient deterrent against conversion to the faith. To this was added social discrimination of the most invidious type. The arms Act had disarmed the whole people, except the Rajputs. In the other echelons of the services, the Rajputs, the Gurkhas and the sikhs manned the militaty establisments, the doors of which were not open to Kashmiris.[46] In short, an illiterate Rajput, a little educated Hindu or a person from outside was preferred to a Kashmiri muslim with similiar qualifications and qualities.

But the times were changing and the Maharaja himself responded to the challenge of the day by introducing a few reforms. But the Muslim community found these reforms inadequate to meet their aspirations. The first expression of the popular movement in Kashmir, however, resented against outsiders who controlled all the ministerial services and enjoyed numerous other privileges. A movement "Kashmir for Kashmiris", which was first started during Maharaja Partap Singh's rule grew stronger with time. The demand of the modern and growing educated elite transcended regional barriers. Several Committees and Commissions were appointed to deal with the problem.[47] Ultimately, a Committee comprising 10 members - both officials and non-officials arrived at a unanimous conclusion.[48] As a result a restrictive definition of State subject was sanctioned in 1927.[49]

The new interpretation to the term state subject, however, satisfied only a handful of middle class youngmen, who saw in the definition an opportunity to obtain the favour of the government. The masses, the peasantry, remained untouched. Much hue and cry was, therefore, raised against the definition of state subject. A great section of the people condemned the definition on the ground that even a thousand years domicile did not entitle one to the privilege of Ist class state subject.[50]

The Kashmiri Muslims, who had either migrated to Punjab to escape oppression during the sikh period or due to repeated famine in the valley or externed by the Dogra rulers due to their political activities from time to time, carried on relentless propaganda against the autocratic Dogra rule and its inability to provide educational and other facilities to the Kashmiri Muslims. They had also founded an organization calling itself "The All India Kashmiri Muslim Conference" which started functioning from Lahore, the capital of Punjab. It offered scholarships to poor

Muslim students from Kashmir desirous of having higher and technical education in India[51]. They were also assisted by the Punjabi Muslims, who had already started taking interest in the welfare of their Kashmiri co-religious brethren. Quite a few Kashmiri Muslim youngmen availed themselves of this facility. They went to the universities in British India for their post-graduate studies in law, science, and arts for which there was no provision in the state. There they happened to mix with their young contemporaries and get stimulated by the national feelings and sentiments. The launching of the first civil disobedience movement by Mahatama Gandhi in 1921, had already made a deep impact on their young hearts.[52] After receiving higher education from Aligarh, Lucknow and other places in India, they returned to Kashmir to inflate the number of discontended.[53] One such intellectual was Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah. Born, in 1905, of a poor family, engaged in the shawl trade. He took his M.Sc degree from the Aligarh Muslim University in 1930. On returning home, he found nothing better than a junior teacher's job in the government High School at Srinagar on a monthly salary of Rupees 60/ - only, "though many of the gazetted officers in various departments of the government were mere matriculates".[54] Sheikh Abdullah, in league with a few compatriots, founded a Reading Room Group in 1930, where lengthy discussions took place, as to how the Muslim grievances could be redressed.[55] The embryonic Reading Room group situated at Fateh Kadal in Srinagar, gradually emerged as the main organization for imparting a definite political character and direction to the political struggle through the organization of small group meetings.[56] While self-interest was undoubtedly a major force behind the discussion in these meetings, there was also a wider interest and concern involving the welfare of the muslim community as a whole.[57] The researcher tried to find out from the respondents the other factors and forces which led to the formation of Reading Room Group in the Valley of Kashmir. The replies of the respondents have been planted in the following tables.

TABLE NO. 1

Factors and Forces	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. Denial of job opportunities to the majority community particularly from Valley	38	54.29
2. Political culturalisation of Kashmiri students in the British Indian Universities due to interaction with the student leaders of the Indian freedom movement.	20	28.58
3. Do not know	22	31.43
	70[57A]	100

Credit goes to "Reading Room Group" for creating an articulate awareness among the Muslims which helped them to protest against injustice and exploitation to which they had been subjected to for generations.[58] In the atmosphere of toil and sufferings, the Reading Room Group guided the Muslim masses, thereby "enhancing their interest in politics and political change".[59]

At about the same time, a similar organization known as Young Man's Muslim Association started functioning at Jammu. Its emissaries went to Srinagar to effect an organizational link up with the Reading Room Group.[60] But the situation was somewhat complicated by the All India Kashmir Muslim conference operating from Lahore, which wanted - a say in the political affairs of the state from outside. Against such a backgroud, the Muslim youngmen of the Reading Room group started their public activities with petitions to the Maharaja asking for better job opportunities for the Muslims. In 1930, a deputation of the Muslim youngmen of the Reading Room Group led by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah waited on the state cabinet. But they had little luck as their petition calling for a larger share of government positions for Muslims was rejected.[61] Sheikh was clearly told that it was impossible to reserve any post for the Muslims of the state if they failed in open competition with other communities. The disappointed leaders returned only to find that elemental forces were throwing them in the forefront of a revolutionary movement for which the state had been patiently waiting for all along.[62]

In support of the political struggle in Kashmir, an extensive and fierce propaganda campaign was let loose from Lahore and other cities of Punjab by the Muslim press, leaflets and journals containing stories of the deliberate suppression of Muslims in the state were distributed in thousands among the people, instigating them to rise against the Maharaja who, it was alleged, was influenced by his Hindu officers. The state government, according to the authors of the propaganda literature, was entirely Hindu and was determined to keep the Muslim majority in perpetual serfdom.[63] The Anglo-Indian press joined the chorus of denunciation of the Maharaja and his government.

Jammu, being near to the Punjab, was first to be affected by his propaganda. In December, 1930, the All Kashmir Muslim Conference, founded a few years earlier, held the annual session in Lahore which was attended by some youngmen from Jammu who, on their return to the state, embarked upon a campaign of agitation against the government. This excited the Muslim residents of Jammu city and adjoining villages.[64] The events of Jammu received widespread support from the valley.

The failure of the autocratic regime to see the writing on the wall led to the intensification of the struggle for political emancipation. Maharaja Hari Singh could have done much to nip the evil in the bud by calling for the aggrieved persons, giving their leaders a patient hearing and extending to them a hand of sympathy and friendship. This would have worked wonders in assuring their agitated minds. But precious little was done by Maharaja towards that end. He always thought it below his dignity to talk to Sheikh Abdullah, a former school teacher in his government on equal terms.[65] In March 1931, Yusaf Shah, an enthusiastic youngman, became the Mirwaiz, the Chief preacher of Srinagar. He at once reversed the conservative politics of his predecessor, Mirwaiz Ahmed Ullah and started sympathising with the activities of the Reading Room Group. He helped Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, who had by then become the hero of Muslim masses,[66] to organize mammoth public meetings in various mosques of Srinagar. In all such meetings Sheikh Abdullah and other top leaders of the Reading Room Group delivered fiery speeches exposing the hardships and depressed condition of the Muslims.[67] In the face of repressive rule, the only forum which was immune from attack and hence could be used for political organization was the mosque. The co-operation of the "clergy had now become a functional necessity".[68]

The month of July brought more miseries to the people. The miserable condition of the Muslims reached the flash point and it needed only a spark to explode.[69] The spark was supplied by the arrest and trial of Abdul Qadir[70] on July 13, 1931. There was open demonstration against the despotic ruler and the entire muslim population rose as one man to protest against repression. There were sharp clashes between the demonstrators and the police, resulting in the death of 21 persons. In the wake of this upheaval, hundreds of muslim demonstrators including Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and Choudhary Ghulam Abbas were arrested and imprisoned. The rathless repression unleased against the political agitators further added to the already simmering discontent.

The political upheaval in Srinagar was an important land mark in the history of Jammu and Kashmir state. The demonstration of open opposition to Dogra rule came as rude shock to the authorities.[71] No one was more distressed by the events than Maharaja Hari Singh. He arranged for a temporary truce between the state and young Muslim leaders spearheading the agitation, but thaw in relations lasted less than two months. During September and October 1931, there was increasing conflict between the authorities and the Muslims of the state. The climate of hostility was aggrevated by militant Punjabi Muslims who crossed in to Jammu province to incite the people to revolt.[72] As the authorities proved increasingly unable to cope with the situation, the Maharaja was forced to seek assistance from the British.

The paramount power in India responded immediately to the Maharaja's appeal by dispatching military units to the state.[73] The civil order was quickly restored but Maharaja had to pay very heavily in return. He conceded the demand for the establishment of a Commission of enquiry presided over by Sir B.J. Glancy of the Foreign and Political Department of the Government of India. The commission, besides the president, had four members: one Hindu and One Muslim from Jammu Province, and one Hindu and one Muslim from the Kashmir province.

The aim of the Glancy Commission was to examine the grievances of the Muslim and other communities and to present a list of the recommendations to the Maharaja.[74] While the commission was conducting its inquiry, events in the state were moving fast. Roused from long political slumber, the people were clamouring for their basic rights.[75] Each community was voicing its grievances, which to the surprise of all, were fundamentally the same. No wonder the people

began seriously to think whether there should not be a united movement to have these basic disabilities removed. The Glancy commission report, published in the spring of 1932, was an important document with major implications for the future of Jammu and Kashmir state.[76] The main recommendations of the report concerning relaxation of restrictions of the Freedom of Press and the Right of free assembly in the state were accepted by Maharaja Hari Singh on March 12, 1932.[77]

The acceptance of Glancy Commission recommendations had two-fold importance in that it recognised the legitimacy of the demand for basic political and civil liberties which the people deserved, and it implied the first major victory reaped by the Muslim subjects of Maharaja as a result of their revolution.[78] The Glancy Commission report opened the flood gates of extensive political activity in the state. The ban on the formation of political organizations having been lifted, the Muslim leaders began to consolidate the mass base of the movement. In order to conduct the movement with strict discipline the Muslim leaders established an organization and a platform in the name of the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference. The new political organization also framed and adopted a constitution of its own. The All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference held its inaugural session in Srinagar during October 15 - 17, 1932 and Sheikh Abdullah was unanimously voted into office as President.[79]

On the enquiry whether the Reading Room Group was ultimately converted into The Muslim Conference, 48.57 percent of respondents responded in the affirmative, 24.29 were of the opinion that some other groups alongwith the Reading Room formed the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference whereas 27.14 expressed their ignorance. The complete break up has been given in the following table:

TABLE NO. 2

Which Group Converted into the All J&K Muslim Conference	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. The Reading Room	34	48.57
2. The Reading Room alongwith others	17	24.29
3. Do not know	19	27.14
	70	100

Thus the Muslim Conference became the only political forum which drew overwhelming support of the entire Muslim community of the state. Henceforth this party spearheaded the battle for freedom against the Dogra regime. The government did not then realise that birth of Muslim Conference would become instrumental in the liquidation of princely rule in less than two decades.[80]

On the enquiry as to which factors and forces ultimately led to the political awakening and organization of political parties in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, the respondents differed in their opinions. Their view points have been shown in the following table.

TABLE NO. 3

Factors which led to the political Awakening and Organization of Political Parties in the State	No. of of Persons	Percentage
1. Authoritarianism of the Dogra regime	30	42.86
2. Spread of Western education	22	31.43
3. Impact of National Movement in India	12	17.14
4. Keen interest of the Kashmiri Muslims externed from the State from time to time in the affairs of the State as well as their propaganda against the Dogra rule	04	5.71
5. British extraordinary interest in the strategically located state and their support to the Muslim masses by exploiting their pitiable condition and using them against the Dogra ruler for their own interest.	01	1.43
6. Religious intolerance by the feudal system and little representation in services to the majority community	01	1.43
	70	100

FOOT NOTE

1. Bamzai, P.N.K.: *A History of Kashmir*
   Delhi, Metropolitan Book Co., 1962, P.386
2. *Rulers of Kashmir:*
   1587 to 1752 Emperor Akbar and Moghal Successors
   1752 to 1819 Ahmed Shah Abdali and Afghan Successors.
   1819 to 1846 Maharaja Ranjit Singh and Sikh Rule.
   1846 to 1857 Maharaja Gulab Singh
   1857 to 1885 Maharaja Ranbir Singh
   1885 to 1925 Maharaja Pratap Singh
   1925 to 1947 Maharaja Hari Singh
   | Dogra Rule
3. "Jammu and Kashmir" (A pamphlet published by publication Division of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, January 1973) P.11.
4. Tyndale Biscoe: *Kashmir in Sun Light and Shade* London, Seeley Service & Co.; 1922, P.79
5. Bomzai, P.N.K. Op.cit., P.458
6. Ibid, P.610
7. Panikar, K.M.: *The Founding of the Kashmir State* London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1953, P.134
8. Moorecroft, William; *Travels in the Himalayan Province of Hindustan and the Punjab; etc.* London, John Murray, 1841, PP.123, 124.
9. Bomzai, P.N.K.: *States of our Union - Jammu and Kashmir,* Delhi, Publication Division Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, 1973, P.12
10. Ibid, P.12
11. A Handbook of Jammu and Kashmir (Published by His Highness's Government of Jammu and Kashmir, Jammu, 1944) P.21
12. Tikoo, P.N.: *History of Kashmir,* New Delhi, Light and Life Publishers, 1979, P.87
13. Khan G.H.: *Freedom Movement in Kashmir,* New Delhi, Light and Life Publishers, 1980, P.14
14. Drew Fredrick: *The Jammu and Kashmir Territories,* Delhi, Oriental Publishers, 1971, P.13.
15. An Englishman who travelled to Kashmir in the mid 19th century, described the institution as follows:

    "When a man is seized for this form of 'begar' his wife and children hang upon him, weeping taking it almost for granted that they will never see him more. A gang of these poor creatures, heavily laden with grain, toiling along the desert crage between Astore and Gilgit, on a burning summer day, urged on by a Sepoy Squad, is perhaps as pittiable a spectacle as any to be seen on the roads of Siberia. But these were not convicts or criminals, they were Mussalman farmers, harmless subjects of the Maharaja".

    Knight, E.F.: *Where Three Empire Meet,* London, Longmans, Green and Co.; 1893, P.67.

16. Khan, G.H.: Op.cit., P.19
17. Bazaz, P.N.: *Inside Kashmir,* New Delhi, Kashmir Publishing Co.; 1941, P.95
18. For examples of religious discrimination under Dogra rule, see Bazaz, P.N.: *The History of Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir.* New Delhi, Kashmir Publishing Co.; 1954, PP.143, 144.
19. Census Commissioner, Jammu and Kashmir State, Census of India 1941: "Jammu and Kashmir" (Jammu, Ranbir Government Press, 1943), P.15
20. Wekefield,, C.E.C.: 'Recollection: *Fifty Years in the Service of India"* Lahore, Civil and Military Gazette, 1942.
21. Lawrence, Waltee P.: *The India We Served* London, Cassell and Co.; 1928, PP.126, 127
22. Bazaz, P.N. *Struggle For Freedom in Kashmir,* New Delhi, Kashmir Publishing Co.; 1954, P.144
23. Many Kashmiris migrated seasonally to the Punjab and the North West Frontier province in search of employment in the late autum, after the crops had been harvested, and returned to the valley in the following spring.

    Census Commissioner, Jammu and Kashmir State. Census of India, 1941: "Jammu and Kashmir" (Jammu, Ranbir Government Press 1943), P. 8.
24. Bazaz, P.N. *Struggle For Freedom in Kashmir* Op.cit., P. 144.
25. Tyndale Biscoe: Op.cit., P. 38
26. Saraf Yusuf: *Kashmiris Fight for Freedom* Lahore, Frozsons Ltd., 1977, Vol.I. P.33
27. Birdwood, Lord *Two Nations and Kashmir* London, R. Hale, 1956, P.20.
28. Khan, G.H. Op.cit., P.54
29. Bushan, Indu. *The Government and Administration of Jammu and Kashmir* Dissertation unpublished, Lucknow University, 1942, P.135
30. Singh, Balbir. *State Politics in India,* Delhi, Macmillan India Ltd., 1982, P.47
31. "Kashmir": Issued by General Secretary, All India State Peoples' Conference, Bombay, January 1939,P.6
32. Bhushan Vidya : *State Politics And Government. Jammu,* Jay Kay Book House, 1985. P.38
33. Kashmir Government records, File No.24N-118 of 1907.
34. Kashmir Government Records, File No.63/60-C of 1921.
35. Saraf Mohammad Yusuf. Op.cit., P.352
36. Bomzai, P.N.K. Op.cit., P.651
37. Ibid., P.710
38. In Silk Factory, which was established at Srinagar during the last years of Ranbir Singh, the inadequately paid labourers raised their voice against the corrupt officers who used to take away a part of their wages on persistent demands, an enquiry was at last instituted. Inspite of the fact that the allegations of corruption proved to be true no strong action was taken against the corrupt officials except transferring them from one block of the factory to the other. The result was that the entire labour force went on

lightening strike in 1924. Their important leaders were arrested. The situation was thus aggrevated. In order to register their protest and make a demonstration of their solidarity with their imprisoned comrades, the entire labour marched in a procession in July 1924. They were joined by their women, children and other sympathisers in the city. A large force of cavalry was rushed which opened fire without giving prior warning to disperse. Scores of people including women and children were injured and trampled under. However, the labours were able to gain a wage increase of six paise per day, though dozens of their leaders were tried and sentenced to various terms of imprisonments (Yusaf Saraf: Kashmiris Fight For Freedom), P.335

39. Kaul Ghwasha Lal. *Freedom Struggle: A Personal Observation* An article in History of Freedom Struggle in Jammu and Kashmir, edited by Mohammad Yasin. (New Delhi, Light and Life Publishers 1980), P.19
40. Saraf Yusaf. Op.cit., P.335
41. Maharaja Pratap Singh was of the view that all lands of Kashmir belonged to him exclusively for the simple reason that territories of Kashmir were purchased by his grandfather, Maharaja Gulab Singh. (Kashmir Government File No. 191/H-75 Block - C of 1906)
42. Saraf Yusaf. Op.cit., P.338, 339.
43. Singh, Balbir, Op.cit., P.52
44. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass. *Jammu and Kashmir,* Martinus Nijhoff/The Hague/1960. P.52
45. In 1920 it was capital offence for a Muslim. Later it was reduced to ten years and still later to seven years (Section 219 of the State Penal Code).
46. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass, Op.cit., P.52
47. "Kashmir": Issued by General Secretary, All India State People's Conference,Bombay, January 1930, P.6
48. Report of the Committee appointed to define the term State Subject, Jammu and Kashmir Government year unknown, Jammu, Preface.
49. State subject definition Notification No.1-L/84/dated 20th April, 1927
50. Constitutional Reforms Commission Report, Jammu and Kashmir Government; P.7.
51. Bazaz, P.N. *Inside Kashmir* Op.cit., P.100-101
52. Bhushan, Vidya, Op.cit., P.71
53. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass. Op. cit., P.54
54. Bazaz, P.N. *History of Struggle For Freedom in Kashmir,* Op.cit., P.148
55. Bazaz, P.N. *Inside Kashmir* Op.cit., P.100-101
56. The persons in addition to Sheikh Abdullah who took initiative for the formation of Reading Room were Mohammad Razab, Qazi Saif-ud-din, Ghulam Ahmed Mukhtar and Maulana Bashir Ahmed. In a sense the Reading Room Party may be said to have been the precursor of a more mature, mass based and well organised political party, the Muslim Conference, Abdul Samad Wani, says that in the early thirties, the muslim Youngmen's Association in Jammu and the Reading Room Party in Kashmir Valley

were formed to organise and arose the muslims against political repression and exploitation. Wani Abdul Samad: "Kashmir Tehreek-e-Azadi", P.22.

57. Kalim, Akhtar: *Sher-i-Kashmir, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah: Tehrik-I-Huriyat-I-Kashmir Ke Aine Mein,* Lahore, Sindhi Sagar Academy, 1968. P.81.

57A The researcher's efforts to interview the whole universe remained unsuccessful either due to the non-cooperation or reluctance of some of the persons particularly M.Ps., M.L.As and Ex-Ministers. Some of the persons were exceptionally candid in their conversation about political events and political process. Some outrightly refused to or evaded interview. Some expressed inability to find time as they were sitting M.L.As and M.Ps and extremely busy and perhaps somewhat reluctant and apprehensive about releasing information. Some persons were quite willing to talk but not willing to fill out the questionnaire even though the questionnaire did not contain penetrating items designed to elicit information about delicate subjects. Inspite of all these difficulties, the researcher succeeded to interviewing seventy respondents.

58. Singh, Balbir, Op. cit., P.48

59. Gupta, Sisir: Kashmir - *A Study of India - Pakistan Relations,* Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1966, P.51.

60. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass, Op. cit., P.54.

61. Bazaz, P.N. Op. cit., P.102.

62. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass, Op.cit., P.55

63. Bamzai, P.N.K., Op. cit., P.713.

64. Bamzai, P.N.K., Op.cit., P.714.

65. Nayar Kuldip: *Distant Neighbours.* New Delhi, Vikas Publications, 1972, P.85.

66. Khan, G.H., Op.cit., P.164.

67. Bomzai, P.N.K., Op.cit., P.714.

68. Dhar, P.N.: *The Kashmir Problem: Political and Economic Background* Indian Quarterly, 1951 Volume VII. P.144.

69. Bomzai, P.N.K., Op.cit., P.715.

70. Abdul Qadir, who was domestic servant of a British Officer, made a highly provocative speech before a congregation at the Khanqah of Shah Hamadan. He was arrested and later tried for treason (13 July 1931).

71. G.E.C. Wakefield is reported to have testified during the official enquiry into the disturbances. "I think we agree that nobody anticipated that the Kashmiri mob would behave in the way it did; consequently no disturbances were anticipated". Quoted in Bazaz, "Inside Kashmir". (Srinagar, Kashmir Publishing Co., 1941), P.180.

72. The most notable Muslim group to be inspired by the crusading spirit was the small Ahrar Party whose leaders organised and dispatched "jathas", or bands of volunteers across the border in to Jammu province.

73. First hand accounts of the British intervention were published in contemporary British Newspapers. See The Times (London) November 1931.

74. "Report on the Administration of Jammu & Kashmir State for 1931-1934". Ranbir Government Press, Jammu 1936, P.34.

75. Bomzai, Op.cit., P.719.

76. For the complete text of this important document see, Jammu and Kashmir State "Grievances Enquiry Commission Report". (Jammu, 1932).

77. Jammu and Kashmir Government - "A Handbook of Jammu and Kashmir State". Ranbir Government Press, Jammu 1947, P.34.

78. Khan, G.H., Op.cit., P.167.

79. "Kashmir's Journey to Freedom". A Survey of Political Events in Jammu and Kashmir State since 1931. Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, Jammu 1948

80. Singh, Balbir, Op.cit., P.48

3

GROWTH OF RIGHTIST PARTIES - A REACTION TO THE NATIONALIST FORCES

GROWTH OF RIGHTIST PARTIES - A REACTION TO THE NATIONALIST FORCES

Of all the political ideas that have gone into shaping our modern world, none has gained wider usage or wielded greater influence than the Right Left concept of political relationship. This is the concept that visualises our political world as a spectrum stretching between two polar extremes - the extreme left denoting revolutionary radicalism and extreme right denoting revolutionary reactionism. Various political schools of thought are ranged between the colours of spectrum according to the intensity of their tendencies.[1]

The term 'Right' stands for the preservation and maintenance of the old or living. The 'Right' includes those parties and movements that are critical of popular government, oppose the bright plans of reformers and do-gooders and draw particular support from men with sizable stake in the established order.[2] Right among other things, means conservatism and lays stress on human weakness than human perfectibility. The rightists favour patriotism, tradition, strong government and non-interference by the state in the economic matters. In fact they are opposed to communism.[3] The Right is sometimes denounced for being reactionary, static, irrational, conservative and status - quoist.[4] Sometimes the term is associated with the people preaching religious fundamentalism as we see in the developing world.

The Right is, thus, the opposite of the left which means negation, protest, agitation, revolt and the like, aiming at the overthrow of the existing order. The left desires change by negating, destroying or over-throwing the existing system by denouncing it as irrational, obscurantist, utopian, romantic and the like. In other words, the left is generally understood to include those parties and movements that demand wider popular participation in government, push actively for reform, and draw particular support from the disinherited, dislocated and disgrunted.[5]

The terms Right and Left are, therefore, poles apart in their meaning. As Prof. Jha says, "The left negates existing reality, the Right affirms it, the Left is revolutionary, the Right conservative, the Left needs utopia, the Right trick, the left strives to change the actual conditions, the Right to idealise them, the Left adopts an attitude of permanent revisionism

towards reality, the Right of opportunism, the left stands for mobility, the Right for intertia; the left for ideology, the Right for tactics; the left clamours for adherence to principles, the right for power and finally, the left is provoked by conditions, the right by the actions and threats of the life."[6]

The terms Right and Left, however, originated in the earliest days of political organization in England. The King sitting in council, arranged his closet supporters near his right and others on the left. The right included his most trusted advisers and those responsible for various administrative tasks of the state. Those sitted to the left of the king were not necessarily opposed to his rule but it may be pointed out that they frequently represented alternative points of view on governmental policies.[7]

In modern times, the Labour Party is regarded as the Party with the left leanings. This party advocates the nationalization of the means of production, greater spending on social services and high progressive taxation.[8] The Socialist objective of the Labour Party is to use the power of the state to reconstruct the British society in such a way that class differences are abolished, the national income increases and is distributed more equally among citizens, and the injustice and exploitation which the socialists associate with the capitalist system, is replaced by a happier and more just set of social relationship. Earlier set of leaders of the Labour Party accepted the Marxist belief that the root of most social evils was the private ownership of the means of production.[9]

The centralist liberals call for decentralization and individualism and also humane social laws.[10] Being the product of Reformation movement, it has always upheld the right of the individual to free opinion. The liberals are marked by their sympathy for the middle and working classes. The Conservative Party having Rightist views stands for the middle and upper classes. The conservatives regard it as their duty to preserve British Institutions and to cherish British traditions. Leaders of the party often claim that their party stands for Queen and Commonwealth. The Conservative Party believes in the improvement of the efficiency of the private sector while sheilding the less privileged from exploitation.[11] This Party has one thing in common with the liberal party and that is its concern for the middle class.

While as the British political parties are divided on ideological lines, there is no marked ideological differences between the two major

political parties of America, the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. The two Party platforms have become increasingly similar to each other.[12] But sometimes the Democratic Party is branded as a Party with left image, [13] leaving the title of Right for the Republican Party. This impression is gathered from the fact that since 1920 the progressives tend to concentrate in the Democratic Party and Conservatives in the Republican Party.[14]

But both Democratic and Republican Parties are neither strictly left nor right in their ideologies in the British sense.[15] Both parties are committed to the maintenance of a democratic system. Some Democratic and some Republicans favour greater control of the economic order. Other Democrates and other Republicans oppose any extension of government intervention in the economic fields. Each party has its share of those who would reduce the nation's efforts in International affairs.[16]

In terms of public policies, each major political party casts longing eyes towards all major voting groups - farmers, labourers, businessmen, senior citizens, ethnic and religious groups and veterans. Both platforms promise something to each group, although what is offered is not necessarily the same. One party may promise more to a given group than another at a given time, but both parties are likely to invade the other's territory with blandishments for votes.[17]

Politicians belonging to both the Democratic and Republican parties assume that the electorate share many beliefs, opinions and ways of thinking or what is rather imprecisely called a "common ideology". It is not surprising, therefore, that both major political parties purport to embrace it and appeal to it.[18]

The Left-Right terminology came into practice in France sometimes towards the end of the eighteenth century.[19] During the French Revolution of 1789 when the king and the Parliament struggled for supremacy, the members of the national Assembly divided themselves in the chamber in accordance with their Left and Right views. Obviously the Rightists were more close to the king.[20] The leftists were the persons who were interested in reforming French society and men through institutional measures. They had goal of human welfare before them.

In the modern day France, political parties cover a range extending from communists and socialists on the left to the anti-parliamentary and even fascist groups on the extreme right.[21] The Left parties - Communist Party and the Socialist Party are more disciplined and their policies are formulated at the Party congresses and in the meetings of the parliamentary groups. The Communist Party is a working class Party and the Socialist Party is the defender of democratic republican institutions. The Guallists alongwith independents represent the Rightist forces.[22] The Guallists Party which has had various names since 1947 adopted a new name Union Des Democratic Pour La (UDR) in 1960. It is a broad based Conservative Party. The UDR inspite of being a rightist party has steadily increased the variety of its national constituency including somewhat wavering but substantial working class support which was the monopoly of the Communist before 1958.[23]

Even in communism which is a left movement, the concept of left and right is found. In Soviet history, there was a group within the communist Party holding extreme idealism which led them during the first half of 1918 to oppose Lenin's practical policies for preserving Soviet rule in Russia. Led by N.I.Bukharin, this group developed during the Party's debate over Lenin's proposals to make peace with Germany, withdraw from World War I and to restore labour discipline in the industrial enterprise. Bukharin and others holding extreme left views believed that instead of making peace, Russia should wage a revolutionary war. A revolutionary war, they said would probably spark socialist revolutions throughout Europe. A conclusion of peace, on the other hand, they insisted would decrease the chances of European revolutions and undermine socialism in Russia.[24]

Stalin who succeeded Lenin as the General secretary of the Russian communist Party had to face opposition within the party from Left Wing leaders, Leo Kamenev and Gragory Zinoviev who had earlier on helped him in his struggle for succession against Trostsky, the man who created the platform called the "Declaration of the Forty six oppositionists."[25] In order to face the opposition from Kamenev and Zinoviev, Stalin built a faithful machine of Party workers and forged a coalition in the Politbureau consisting of right wing leaders like Aleksei Rykov and Mikhail Tomsky. Step by step Stalin was able to isolate Kamenev and Zinoviev to such an extent that they abjectively made a confession of their errors. They were subsequently removed from their positions by Stalin.[26]

Once the socalled leftists were subdued, Stalin borrowed their programme (collectivization of agriculture and intensive industrialization) and introduced it as a Soviet policy. The so called rights - Aleksei Rykov and Mikhail Tomsky became restive. Stalin alleged that he had discovered a plot of the right wing group to consolidate forces with the remanants of the leftist faction. Under Stalin's attack, Rykov and Tomsky capitulated; they confessed of their sins and asked to be permitted to do battle against all deviations from the general line of the party. But they were soon removed from the important positions they had held.[27]

At the beginning of 1934, Stalin could boast of complete victory, "The anti-Leninist Trotskyite group has been defeated and scattered. The anti-Leninist group of the right deviationists has been defeated and scattered....the national deviationists group has been defeated and scattered....the party today is united as it has never been before".[28] Thus, in his struggle for absolute power, Stalin narrowed the margin of permissible dissent from the opposition until it disappeared.[29]

Stalin died in March 1953 and was succeed by Khrushchev. At a closed door meeting of the twentieth Party Congress in February 1956, Khrushchev criticised Stalin for building a personality cult in the communist Party but at the same time he praised him for liquidating leftist and rightist groups from the party.[30]

Even at present there are two strong opposing factions in existence in the communist party of Russia Boris Yeltsin, the brass populist represents the leftist faction of the party. He was ousted as Moscow communist party boss and candidate member of Politbureau in 1988, and has become a symbol of opportunities and obstacles that Gorbachev now faces. Yeltsin's triumph, alongwith the defeat of party hacks from Siberia to Lithuania, represented a fiestly revolt against the failure of Gorbachev reforms to improve the harsh realities of Soviet life.[31] Yeltsin has constantly criticised Gorbachev for being half-hearted in his approach to many acute problems facing the country.[32]

Yegor Ligachev, the member of the Communist Party politbureau alongwith the former KGB Chief victor Chebbrikov represents the conservative trends in the Communist Party. This faction is bitterly opposed to the policy of reforms initiated by Gorbachev.[33]

Gorbachev has staked out the political centre, a difficult role for a self-avowed radical with a penchant for controlled choas. It is, as Soviets say, no accident that Gorbachev permits Boris Yeltsin to attack him from the left, while hardliner Yegor Ligachev snipes at him from the right.[34] The dance between the left and right in Russia is astounding, says the Harriman Institute's Robert Legvold, "Gorbachev postpones many decisions, but when there are hard choices to be made, he opts squarely for change. As centralists often do, he is losing popularity, but across the ideological spectrum, he is deemed indispensable."[35]

It may be pointed out here that factions of left and right within a single party are not always due to ideology. Sometimes members are simply divided on account of their loyalty to their faction leaders.[36]

Left and Right leaning in politics have also been witnessed in the contemporary developing world. But these terms have not been used and interpreted by the politicians in the same way as in the West and Socialist world. As most of the developing countries in Asia and africa are old societies having different and distinct culture and traditional heritage of their own as well as economically backward with low literacy rate, they are more sensitive to religion, caste, communal, regional and local sentiments. The interests there, still tend to be defined predominantly in terms of tribe, races, religion or communal reference groups. The divergent interests of the people are rooted in and find expression through communal groups. For instance the rightist parties in the Muslim world are fundamentalist in their thinking and behaviour, infuse and propagate religious feelings and exploit masses on the basis of religion. In India these parties like Jan Sangh emphasized racial or cultural superiority, an aggressive nationalism, symbols of greatness, national solidarity and the exclusion of religious or ethnic minorities from membership of the nation.

In the quest to further confirm as on what bases a party is termed as Rightist in the Indian context, the researcher enquired from the respondents their view points which are presented in the following table.

TABLE NO. 4

The reasons as to why Muslim Conference, Plebiscite Front, Praja Parshid-Jan Sangh - B.J.P., Jamaat-e-Islami and the Awami Action Committee are called Rightist Parties	No. of Person	Percentage
1. Religious based	40	57.14%
2. Opposed to Socialism	10	14.29%
3. Feudal Outlook	10	14.29%
4. Traditionalist in their approach	5	7.14%
5. Plead for the establishment of religious state	4	5.71%
6. Dominated by Business class opposed to radical policies	1	1.43%
	70	100%

The left political parties, on the other hand, are those which support progressive policies and are anti-religious and anti-fundamentalist in their outlook as well as behaviour. They, therefore, support secularism, socialism, democracy and progressive policies such as land reforms, public ownership, equal distribution of economic resources and liquidation of all sort of exploitation.

In the light of Left - Right controvery and keeping in view the peculiar conditions of India which is a developing country, we can safely arrive at the conclusion that Muslim League and Hindu Mahasabha at the national level and Akali Dal and Muslim conference at the regional level were the true rightist parties at work in the pre-independent Indian political scene. All these parties were pragmatic and traditionalist in outlook.[37]

On December 30, 1906, in Dacca, a group of Muslim Leaders joined together to found the Muslim league. This organization was set up to protect and advance the political rights and interests of Muslims of India. But in actual practice the Muslim league represented the feudal and

upper class interests. It always fought for the number of seats to be reserved for Muslims in the central and provincial legislatures and for the reservation of jobs in the top echelons of administration. These demands served the interests of the upper class Muslims and hardly reflects the aspirations of the Muslim masses.[38]

Credit goes to Muslim League for being the first major rightist political group founded on All India basis. It was communal in the sense that its membership was confined to one community and its programme was the furtherence of the political and general well-being of that community.[39]

Earlier leaders of the Muslim League were Mohammad Ali Johar, Shaukat Ali and Mohammad Ali Jinah. It was an English speaking group thoroughly loyal, merely asking for jobs for the group that it represented.[40] The rise of Muslim league as a political party was the result of British patronage, although considering the selfish character of the Hindu middle class who would not permit others to share with them the fruits of political progress, it was not altogether unnatural. From the very circumstances of its origin, the League leadership remained in the hands of landed aristocracy and found a fertile field of its growth, for example, in the United Provinces especially in Oudh where the traditional land holders were by far the most powerful.[41]

In the beginning many members of the Muslim League were also the members of the Indian National Congress. [42] But with the passage of time, this party adopted a fully communal line of action. In the Lahore session of the Muslim League held in 1940, demand for Pakistan was made. The Party launched a vigorous drive for the achievement of its objective and India was partitioned in 1947 on communal lines.

The present Indian Union Muslim League, though having no links with the old body, derived its name and ideology from the muslim League of Mohammad Ali Jinah. It is a party of Muslims and it has strongholds in the states of Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Union territory of Pondicherry with pockets of influence in the other southern states. For some time Indian Union Muslim league shared power with Congress party in Kerala. It also extended support to the imposition of emergency by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. [43] The prominent leaders of the party are Suleman Sait and Mohammad Koya.

The Birth of the Hindu Mahasabha, another rightist party, was the result of the fears of Hindu reactionaries against the founding of Muslim

league. In 1907, soon after the founding of the Muslim League united Bengal Hindu Movement was formed. It comprised of a group of more moderate Hindus who were not in sympathy with the revolutionary activities of ardent nationalists led by Aurobindo Ghosh and others. Also founded in 1907, the Punjab Hindu Mahasabha became the spearhead of the movement that eventually led to the establishment of the Akhil Bharat Hindu Mahasabha.[44] In December, 1913, the Punjab Hindu Sabha sponsored a meeting at Allahabad in which all India Hindu Mahasabha was set up. In the beginning this organization was not communal in character and many of its leaders, like Lajpat Rai and Madan Mohan Malaviya were also the members of the Indian National Congress.[45] it was at a later stage that Hindu fundamentalists took charge of the organization. Its hardline leaders like Sarvakar resolved to create out of the heterogenous institution of caste something in the nature of a religious fraternity that might impart to Hindus the character of a cohesive political community. [46] Dominated by a class of landed aristocracy and tradition bound upper class educated Hindus, its leadership used religion as a means to secure its political goals.[47]

During its prime, Hindu Mahasabha was dominated by Guru Golwalker, Hedgewar and Sarvarkar. This party was banned in 1948, in the wake of murder of Mahatama Gandhi but after sometimes this ban was lifted. Hindu Mahasabha of today is a small, politically unimportant party which keeps alive the flicker of the communal politics of Sarvarkar's leadership.[48]

Leftist ideology before independence was represented by the communist party. It was founded in 1924 by Satya Bhakta, a journalist from Kanpur.[49] It was banned by the British government in India. Then many leaders of the party joined the congress and alongwith the leftists in the congress organization tried to implement their programme. When the Indian National Congress started the Quit India Movement against the British Rule in August 1942, it did not support the congress party and appealed to the people to help the British government. For this betrayal the congress expelled it from its ranks which was working then as the left wing of the congress. After that the communist party of India began to work independently.[50]

Post Independent Scenario

It is interesting to note that old Rightist parties more or less made their disappearance from the Indian political scene in the wake of

partition and independence and new rightist outfits emerged on the political horizon of India and made their presence felt in the years to come. Some of the rightist parties which were at work in India from time to time after 1947 have been Ram Rajya Parishad, Jan Sangh, Swantantar Party, Congress(O) and Bhartiya Lok Dal.

The researcher tried to find out from the respondents as to which political parties particularly in the post-independent India can be termed as Rightist. Their replies have been shown in the following table.

TABLE NO. 5

	Rightist Parties in India	No. of Persons	Percentage
1.	Hindu Mahasabha, B.J.P. and Indian Union Muslim League	35	50.00
2.	Hindu Mahasabha, B.J.P., Indian Union Muslim League and Swatantar Party	18	25.71
3.	Only Swatantar Party	1	1.43
4.	No. Party strictly Left or Right	1	1.43
5.	Do not know	15	21.43
		70	100%

Ram Rajya Parishad, a right wing party was founded in 1948. This party soon disappeared from the political scene because of its ultra conservative views. [51] Some of its activists later on joined the ranks of Jan Sangh.

The Akhil Bharatiya Jan Sangh with a radical right image was a product of post independent India. It was founded by Dr. Shayama Prasad Mukerjee in 1951. In its fold it attracted many former members of Hindu Mahasabha and other conservative elements in the Hindu society. This party stood for rebuilding of India on the basis of Bharatiya Sanskriti and Maryada. [52] It had great faith in the traditional Indian values and believed in the ideal of "one country, one culture and one Bharatiya nation".[53] This had led the party to be dubbed as fascist. The Jan Sangh in India had emphasized those concepts familiar in fascism: the leader principle, racial or cultural superiority, an aggressive

nationalism, symbols of greatness, national solidarity, and the exclusion of religions or ethnic minorities from the membership of the nation; one particular interest of the party was the protection of the holy cow.[54] The party became an important constituent of the Janta Party in 1977. Fall of Morarji government in 1979 resulted in the disintegration of Janta Party and some of the prominent Jan Sangh elements in the party formed a new political outfit Bhartiya Janta party.[55]

Although we regard Bharatiya Janta Party a Rightist party, many prominent leaders of the party do not agree to this label. Atal Bihari Vajpai in his presidential address at the Bhagalpur session of Party in 1972, declared, "We are neither moving Right nor Left, we are moving forward and we will march ahead to fulfill our destiny of providing right alternative to the nation".[56]

Another important rightist party at work on the Indian political scene has been Swantantra party founded by C. Rajagopalachari in 1959. The Swantantra party had a programme opposed to that of Congress. It was opposed to the expansion of state activity and was in favour of greater individual freedom and initiative. It stood for unregulated private enterprise in the economic sphere and maximum liberty of the individual in the political sphere. It was openly opposed to economic planning, socialism and communisms.[57]. It condemned state monopoly in the economic sphere and was opposed to the principle of nationalisation of commerce and industry. The party advocated the achievement of economic progress through competitive methods of production and distribution [58]. In the General Elections of 1962 the Swatantra party got remarkable success and became the official opposition in Orissa, Rajasthan, Bihar and Gujrat. In Orissa Swantantra led coalition Government was formed after the Fourth General elections in 1967. In January 1971, after the withdrawal of support of Jan Congress, the Chief Minister R.N. Singh, tendered his resignation and the assembly was dissolved. The Swatantra party is defunct now.

The congress party has always been regarded as the chief party representing a a historical consensus and enjoying a continuing basis of support and trust.[59] It provided shelter to people of divergent political views.[60] Before the split of 1969 this party was viewed as a centralist party wedded to the cause of socialism which meant trend towards left. After the split, the left elements remained in the congress party and the rightists broke away forming a new political party Congress(O).[61] In

addition to Congress (O) other rightist parties on the political scene in 1969 were the Bharatiya Lok Dal which was moderate right and Bharatiya Jan Sangh, occupying the extreme right in the Indian Political spectrum.[62]

In 1977, Janta Party emerged on the political scene of India and in the process disturbed considerably the existing position. The socialist party (Moderate left) and the Congress for Democracy and the Young Turks led by Chander Shekar (left of the centre) combined with the Congress (O), the Bharatiya Lok Dal (Moderate Right) and the Jan Sangh (Extreme Right). This new grouping of political elements was joined by a new electoral ally CPM (Extreme left).

Janta Party which was the combination of conflicting ideologies formed a strong front against Congress which was a centralist party with left leanings. Janta Party with odd combination emerged on the political scene as a reaction to the imposition of internal emergency by Mrs. India Gandhi resulting in the curbing of democratic political rights. Curbs on civil liberties and suppression of democratic rights became a central issue in the election campaign of Janta Party in March 1977.[63] The left-right alliance of Janta Party won 1977 elections Confortably securing 2/3 majority and ruled the country for more than two years. The Communist Party of India (CPI)) had silently supported emergency and was not happy with the left-right (Janta) friendship. The Communist Party of India (M) defended its alliance with the rightist forces on the ground that it was not giving up its leftism by stressing political democracy and that Janta Party was not a right wing party as far as political issues were concerned.[64]

Pradid Bose, the well known analyst has come to certain interesting conclusions keeping in view the 1977 development; First, the violation of fundamental rights were objected to by the masses and economic gains were of secondary nature.

Secondly, mixing up of different political trends within the Janta Party successfully challenged the centralist congress party and defeated it on all India level.

Thirdly, the extreme left of CPI(M) and the extreme right of Jan Sangh became involved in a big way in the administrative functioning of the government.[65]

With the fall of Janta Government at the Centre in the year 1980, the old left and right elements split up and formed their own respective parties, Jan Sangh retained its independent indentity and renamed itself as Bharatiya Janta Party.[66] A splinter group headed by Balraj Madhok which had earlier on parted company with the persons joining the Janta Party, continued to be known as the Bhartiya Jan Sangh. Charan Singh who had been instrumental in the fall of Janta Government formed the Lok Dal with his supporters. Members of the old Socialist Party either remained with the Janta Party or joined Lok Dal. Dismembrament of the Janta Party once again brought Congress in the limelight and this party swept the polls of December, 1980 under the dynamic leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

Growth of Rightist Parties in the State of Jammu and Kashmir

After an analysis of the main rightist parties on the national scene, we shift our course of study to the state of Jammu and Kashmir. The people in the state of Jammu and Kashmir, in line with their political socialization, tend to give far more importance to ethno-religious and regional identites than to considerations of a unified and secular political culture. This among other things, has led to the development of a phenomenon in which northern Kashmiri speaking valley, predominantly Muslim has remained impregnated with islamic fundamentalism and the Dogri speaking Southern region, preponderantly Hindu, has become vulnerable to the Hindu chauvinistic tendencies. The Muslim fundamentalist generally make a show of their pan-Islamic loyality and attachment to the Muslim country across the border, whereas their counterparts in Jammu area like to over emphasise nationalism and a complete merger of the state of Jammu and Kashmir with the Indian Union. Likewise, the people in the Kashmir valley like to put more emphasis on the issue of autonomy of the state whereas in Jammu they in the existing set up, tend to favour a strong centre. The Kashmir Rightist organizations, predominently often Muslims mount pressure for the autonomy of the state as against the centre whereas their counterparts in the Hindu dominated Jammu area demand autonomy against the Kashmiri Muslim domination.

Unfortunately, the people in the State of Jammu and Kashmir have been mobilized in such a way that they lay more emphasis on ethno-religious considerations and ignore cultural, regional and economic factors. Due to the concentration of the people of one community in a

particular region, religion and region in the case of the state of Jammu and Kashmir have become almost synonymous. Therefore, any movement in Jammu region would ultimately be identified with the Hindus and in the Kashmir valley with the muslims. A careful study of the political developments in the state would reveal that the formation and shaping of most of the political parties, right from the very beginning has been greatly determined by the factor of religion. For example, the Muslim Conference in the Kashmir valley was organised to give direction to the Muslims of Kashmir and the Praja Parishad came into existence to represent the Hindus of Jammu. In fact, the rightist parties in the Kashmir valley arose as a reaction against the rule of autocratic Hindu Raja and the rightist Organisations of Hindus in Jammu arose as a reaction to the rightist movements in Kashmir.

In the light of the above observation we can come to the conclusion that Muslim Conference plebiscite Front, Awami Action Committee, Jammat Islami and Praja Parishad -Jan Sangh - Bhartiya Janta Party have been some of the important rightist parties at work on the political scene of the state from time to time in the last 60 years.[67]

FOOT NOTES

1. Krogh, Kenneth: *Political Thought Since World War II* New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964, P.445
2. Gramston: *The New Left* London, Badly Head, 1970, P.13.
3. Walter Langueur: *A Dictionary of Politics*. Oxford University press, 1964, P.310.
4. Krogh, Kenneth: Op.cit., P.445.
5. Ibid., P.446.
6. Jha, B.K.: *Marxism of the New Left* Indian Journal of Political Science, Volume XXXIX, No.4, 1978, P.539.
7. Rodee Anderson: *Introduction to Political Science* Christol Green, New Delhi, Tata McGraw Hill, 1977, P.91-92
8. Curtis Michael; *Comparative Govt. and Politics* London, Harpet & Raw, Publishers, 1978, P.158
9. Birch, A.H., *The British System of Government* London, Minerva Series of Student Hand Book, 1982, P.126.
10. Curtis Michael, Op. cit., P.158
11. Birch, A.H., Op.cit., P.128-129
12. Lawson, Kay,: *The Comparative Study of Political Parties* New york, St. Martins press, 1976, P.156

13. Ibid., P.157.

14. Mc Henry Dean,: *Elements of American Government* New York, MacGraw Hill Book Co., Inc., 1962, P.126

15. Bone Hugh,: *American Politics and Party System* New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1965, P.119

16. Penniman Haward,: *The American Political Process* Princeton New Jersy, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.1962, P.60

17. Bone, Hugh: Op.cit., P.120

18. Ibid., P.118

19. L.K.Advani,: *Jan Sangh and Leftism* Organiser, January 29, 1972, P.32

20. Rodee, Anderson, Op.cit., P.92

21. Pickles, Dorthy,: *The Fifth French Republic* Delhi, B.I. Publications, 1978, P.64

22. Bond Jean,: *The Government of France* London, Methuen & Company Ltd., 1974, P.90

23. Carter Gwendolen: *The Government of France* New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanowich, Inc. 1972, P.40

24. *The New Encyclopaedia Britainica, Volume VI* U.S.A., 1977, P.121

25. Andrew William,: *Soviet Institutions and Policies-Inside View,* New Jersey, D. Van, Nostrand Company, Inc. 1966, p.86

26. Dragnich, Alex,: *Major European Governments* Illinois, The Dorsay Press, 1970, P.377

27. Ibid.

28. Merle, Fainsod: *How Russia is Ruled* Harvord University Press, 1963, Pp..190-208

29. Ibid.

30. Dragnich Alex, Op.cit., P.381-82.

31. Time (New York)April 10, 1989, P.21-22.

32. The Times of India (New Delhi) September 25, 1989, P.14.

33. Time (New York) Op.cit., P.23

34. Time (New York) January 1, 1990, P.23

35. Ibid.

36. Lawson, Kay, Op.cit., p.139

37. Narang, A.S.: *Indian Government and Politics* New Delhi, Gitanjli Publishing House, 1987, P.276

38. Engineer, Asghar Ali,: *Islam and Muslim: A Critical Assessment* Jaipur, Printwell Publishers 1985, P.168.

39. Craig, Baxter,: *Jan Sangh* Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvanis Press, 1969, P.7

40. Smith, W.C.; *Modern Islam in India* Delhi, Usha Publication, 1979, P.297

41. Mishra, B.B.; *The Indian Political Parties* Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1976, P.159

42. Craig, Baxter, Op.cit., P.8
43. Engineer, Asghar Ali, Op.cit., P.169
44. Baxter, Craig, Op.cit., P.6
45. Ibid.
46. Mishra, B.B., Op.cit., P.321
47. Ibid., P.322.
48. Craig, Baxter, Op.cit., P.6
49. Narang, A.S. Op.cit., P.311
50. Aggarwal, R.C.: *Indian Government and Politics* New Delhi, S. Chand and Company Ltd., 1986, P.486
51. Raman, Sunder,: *Indian Government and Politics* New Delhi, Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1988, P.250
52. Puri,Geeta,: *Bharatiya Jan Sangh* New Delhi, Janta 1980, P.11
53. Dass, Hari Hara, Dass Sasmita : *Indian Government and Politics* Delhi, Sangita Printers, 1988, P.260
54. Curtis Michael, op.cit., P.159.

    (This view point is also shared by Balraj Puri, the noted Journalist of Jammu and Shri Krishan Dev Sethi, the leader of Democratic National Conference. Information was gathered from the two gentlemen during the interviews this scholar had with them on 10.12.1989 and 21.12.1989 respectively).
55. For more information about Jan Sangh please see Chapter-IV.
56. Puri, Geeta: Op.cit., P.8
57. Dass, Hari Hara, Dass, Sasmita: Op.cit., P.258
58. Ibid
59. Mohiuddin Iqbal: *Political Geography of India* New Delhi, Adam Publishers and Distributors, 1987, P.142.
60. Dass, Hari Dass, Sasmita: Op.cit., P.252
61. Gokhle, B.K.: *A Study of Political Theory* Bombay, Himalayan Publishing House, 1979, p.384
62. Bose Pradipt: *The Left and Right in Indian Politics*, November 4, 1979, P.13
63. Narang, A.S,. Op.cit., P.296
64. Ibid.
65. Narang, A.S., Op.cit., P.305
66. Narang, A.S., Op.cit., P.305
67. A detailed study of the Rightist parties in the State of Jammu and Kashmir has been taken up in Chapter-IV.

4

A STUDY OF THE RIGHTIST PARTIES

A STUDY OF THE RIGHTIST PARTIES

In order to understand the role played by the Rightist Parties in the politics of Jammu and Kashmir, one should have an adequate knowledge about their origin, organization, ideology, support base, leadership, electoral performance, etc. Some of them are pre-date or have emerged soon after the independence of the state from the autocratic rule of the Dogra dynasty. Others such as Muslim united Front, are of a recent origin on the political scene of the state. It is, however, evident that the Rightist parties have come to stay as a prominent and durable feature of Kashmir's political landscape. This development is natural and may very well have been anticipated in a vast and variegated but geographically, culturally, racially, linguistically and ethnically heterogenious state with three principal socio-cultural and disparate regions; Jammu, the Kashmir valley, and Ladakh. In other words combined alchemy of history, culture, religion, language and economy has given a unique identity to each of these regions and each of them has become the homeland of distinct ethno-national and religio-cultural community. In fact, various regions of the state have their distinct regional and political personalities and political and emotional divergence between them have been growing over the years.

The Rightist parties in the state also provide the channel through which religio-cultural and ethnic identities find expression and their aspirations and demands are articulated and aggregated. They not only exploit local sources of discontentment but also press a variety of primordial demands based on religion, region, caste and culture. Most of them have no hope of capturing power or being able to play a decisive role at the centre. They simply perceive themselves to be an essential pressure group for promoting and protecting the interests of religious and regional communities. They, therefore, mobilize local support by playing up real or imagined feelings of discrimination or depreivation. In short, each Rightist party in the state of Jammu and Kashmir has not only religio-cultural or regional support base but also has religio-cultural issue orientation.

All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference

The popular upsurge started by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and his associates in the Reading Room culminated in the birth of a political

organization.[1] The venue for its inception was the Pather Masjid at Zainakadal.[2] The name of this organization was baptised as the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim conference. On this occasion, it is believed, the Mosque had been converted into a shrine owing to the presence of about three lakh of people from all over the State attending the convention.[3] Although inspired by the progress of the Indian National Movement, the Muslim Conference emerged on the political horizon in the form of a communal uprising and soon became the only representative body of the Muslims of the State.[4]

The first session of the party was held in Srinagar from 15 to 17 October, 1932. From 1932 to 1938 there were six annual sessions of the party. Four sessions held in Srinagar, Mirpur, Jammu and Poonch were presided over by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah. Third and fourth sessions were held in Sopore and Srinagar and they were presided over by Mian Ahmed Yar and Chowdhary Ghulam Abbas respectively.[5]

The Muslim Conference had a revolutionary potential and it was focused against an old time oppressive and exploitative regime but owing to its being rooted into primordialism it failed to escape the trauma of a conservative and reactionary bias. The counterpart Hinduites viewed this movement as pan-Islamic in nature.[6]

During the early years of its life, the main aim of the Muslim conference was to see that more and more Muslims were absorbed in the government services, as recommended by the Glancy Commission of 1931. "It is reported that no single issue absorded the attention of young leaders of the Muslim Conference more than the lack of opportunities for Muslim employment in the state services."[7] It was only later on that they realised that the employment of a few more muslims by the state would not solve the problems of the muslim masses. They, then, began to clamour for a responsible government.[8] In the face of pressure from the agitating masses under the banner of Muslim Conference and prodded by the reform minded British, Maharaja Hari Singh issued Regulation No.-1 on April 22, 1934. The Regulation contained a new constitution which provided for the establishment of a legislative Assembly known as Praja Sabha.[9]

But the Muslim Conference was not satisfied with the piecemeal concessions. It, therefore, decided to continue its struggle and non-violent agitation. It expressed a firm commitment to the policies and ideology of an elected and wholly responsible government in the state in

accordance with the aspirations of the people.[10] The Working Committee of the Muslim Conference met on February 7, 1936 and passed a resolution asking the people to observe Responsible Government Day throughout the State. The resolution also demanded a new constitution and an Assembly in which it was not easy for the government to crush the people's resolution underfoot.[11] In accordance with the resolution of the working committee, the Muslim Conference party observed May 8, 1936 as a Responsible Government Day. It was on this occasion that Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, as President of the Muslim Conference, made a fervent appeal to all citizens, eliciting their co-operation in the observance of the day. The response was tremendous; The Muslims, the Hindus and the Sikhs closed their ranks to make the day a success.[12]

In its on going struggle against the autocratic rule, the Muslim Conference issued a charter of National Demands in August 1938. The charter stated that the ultimate goal of the party was to bring about a complete change in the social and political outlook of the people and to achieve a responsible government under the aegis of the Maharaja.[13]

Retooling Politics

The All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference remained in existence upto June 1939 when it transferred itself into the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference. But this change did not come all of a sudden. The experience of six years following the birth of Muslim Conference had more than adequately revealed to the Muslim leadership that narrow communal politics would certaintly be no remedy for the ills of large scale poverty, economic hardship and exploitation faced by the people of the state, such was not the lot of the muslims alone, non Muslims suffered almost equally. Sheikh Abdullah and his colleagues fully realised that an agitation against the autocratic ruler could not succeed without the support of all the communities. The attitude of the secular elements had convinced the Sheikh that they, would have no hesitation in joining the movement.[14] He objected to the fact that 'only Muslims' were allowed to be its members.[15]

The Sheikh was also immensely influenced by the charismatic leadership of both Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru and by the secular nature of the civil disobedience movement launched by the Congress party. His own political commitment and convictions, the attitude of the secular elements in the state and the impact of the congress ideology with its rich traditions of service and sacrifice, all combined to

change his basic thinking. In fact, the leadership of the Indian National Congress was permeated with ideas close to his heart[16] and he felt very uneasy in a communal organization -a round man in a square hold.[17]

On the enquiry as to which of the Indian political personalities influenced Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah in the secularisation of Kashmir politics and conversion of the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference into the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference enabling the non - Muslim communities of the State to join its ranks, the respondents gave the following view points:-

TABLE NO. 6

Political Personalities who influenced Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru	20	28.57
2. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru as well as the State leaders like Prem Nath Bajaj, Budh Singh Kashap Bandhu	15	21.42
3. Realization by Sheikh Abdullah at a latter stage that he and his party would not succeed in their political struggle in the State unless they secured the support of non-Muslims also.	10	14.29
4. Due to the impact of the secular policies of the Indian Congress on the minds of the then emerging Kashmiri elite	10	14.29
5. Emergence of certain secular elements within the Party itself.	8	11.43
6. To refute the charge that the party was a communal one and therefore fighting against the Hindu Maharaja	5	7.14
7. Expressed their ignorance	2	2.86
	70	100

In his presidential address to the sixth annual session of the Muslim Conference on 26th March, 1938, Sheikh Abdullah observed: "West must end communalism by ceasing to think in terms of Muslims and non-Muslims when discussing our political problems...and we must open our doors to all such Hindus and Sikhs who like ourselves believe in the freedom of their country from the shackles of an irresponsible rule.[18]

Rapid secularisation of communal politics in Kashmir eventually accelerated the process of converting the Muslim Conference into a secular body.[19] The Sheikh was able to place a resolution embodying his views before the working committee of the Muslim Conference on 28 June, 1938. Inspite of the opposition of Mirza Afzal Beg and others, the working committee adopted the resolution and recommended to the General Council that, in the forthcoming session of the conference, the name and the constitution of the organization be so altered and amended that the people of all religion, castes and creeds join the struggle for political emancipation.[20]

A special session of the Muslim Conference was held on June 10, 1939 to consider the resolution of the working committee. This session was attended by 176 delegates from all the districts of the State and it was presided over by Kh. Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq.[21] Some of the hardliners in the party expressed their doubts that a secular organization would tend to gravitate towards the Indian National Congress, and the Hindu - Sikh group of Kashmir state would undermine the movement because of their vested interests in the Dogra rule. Their fears were allayed by off the record understanding that the movement would steer clear of both the Congress and the Muslim League. With this understanding, the resolution was unanimously passed by the special session on June 11, 1939[22] which changed the name of the Muslim Conference to the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, thus formally opening its doors to all.

On the enquiry as to why some of the leaders of erstwhile All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference particularly from Jammu did not agree to the secularisation of Kashmir politics as well as the conversion of the party into the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, the respondents came out with the replies as given in the following table :

TABLE NO. 7

Reasons for opposing conversion of All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference into All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference and secularisation of the politics by some of the members.	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. Fanatic attitude	18	14.29
2. Personal Political ambitions	25	35.71
3. Close contact with All India Muslim League	22	31.43
4. Do not know	13	18.57
	70	100

Re-emergence of Muslim Conference

The forces of communalism and reaction nurtured so long by the interested elements were not entirely absent from Kashmir. When the Muslim Conference was converted into National Conference there was opposition from among some of the prominent leaders who continued to keep their group alive in the new body.[23] Sheikh Abdullah, as the President of National Conference, found himself caught on the horns of a difficult and painful dilemma as to how the party way to pursue a policy designed to appeal to both its Hindu and Muslim members? In attempting to resolve the dilemna, Sheikh Abdullah adopted a policy of first pleasing one community and then the other, with the result that both Hindus and Muslims became thoroughly alienated. The damage inflicted on the party by this policy was considerable. In December, 1939, Sheikh abdullah took the Hindu side on the issue involving the use of Devanagri script in schools and Civil Service Examinations. Ch. Abbas and Sardar Abrahim interpreted Abdullah's action as a a betrayal of the Muslim cause. After an uneasy stay in the National Confrence, they resigned from the party and, in the process, took most of the Jammu Muslim members with them. Ch. Abbas and Sardar Abrahim joined forces with other dissatisfied Muslims like Allah Rakha Sagar and resurrected the Muslim Conference in 1941. They were also able to secure the support of Mir Waiz Yusuf Shah and his followers in the valley.[24] Though leading a tottering existence, the Muslim Conference

received a new lease of life at the hands of Mr. Jinah and his Muslim League in the later years.[25] Secular outlook of Sheikh Abdullah, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawahar Lal Nehru did not appeal to the new Muslim Conference leaders.[26] The defection of Ghulam Abbas and his followers was a great set back to Sheikh Abdullah and his National Conference. This defection of Jammu was only partially offset by the recruitment of the non-Muslims.[27]

Membership of Muslim Conference

For becoming the basic member of the party a person required the following qualifications:-

1. A permanent state subject
2. Firm faith in the tenants of Islam
3. Age above 18 years
4. Matriculation certificate

In addition, every member was required to pay four annas annual membership fee.[28]

Organizational Structure

At the top of the party heirarchy there was a President, ten Vice-President, one General Secretary, and four Secretaries. The President of the organization was elected every year in an open session.

The vice-Presidents, General Secretary and the Secretaries were elected in the annual session and their term of office was the same as that of the President. The President and the Senior Vice-President were not from the same province. A person who was not the basic member could not hold any party office.[29]

General Council

The General Council of the party consisted of one hundred members. They were elected from among the members of the party. They could remain in their offices till the next session of the party. Every member had to pay rupees three as fee for the membership of the council. All the office bearers of the party were also the members of the General Council.[30] Sessions of the General Council were called by the President of the party or by the General Secretary. The sessions of the General Council were held atleast four times in a year. Quorum for all such meetings was thirty. The General Council was responsible for

summoning the annual sessions of the party. It also elected the presidents for the annual sessions.[31]

Working Committee

The Working Committee of the party comprised fifty members. They were elected by the members of the General Council. Meetings of the working committee were held every month.[32] The working committee was responsible for implementing the decisions taken in the meetings of the General Council. It also kept the General Council informed about various steps taken for achieving the objectives of the party.[33] The president of the party was authorised not only to requisition the meetings of the working committee but also to preside over them.

Branches of the party were set up at the provincial, district and tehsil levels. Tehsil level conference committees consisted of the local or basic units.[34]

Finances of the Party

Finances to meet the day-to-day expenses of the party were collected from the members. As already pointed out every basic member had to pay four annas as annual membership fee. Moreover, every member of the General council had to pay rupees three annually to the party funds. In addition to it, the organization used to accept donations from different sources. The party proposed to set up a party fund amounting to rupees one lakh. This amount was to be deposited in the co-operative banks in the name of the party. The expenditure incurred on the activities of the party was to be met out of this fund.[35]

Ideology and Programme of the Muslim Conference

The Muslim Conference committed itself to the following:-

a) To organise the Muslims of the state and secure for them their rights.

b) To struggle for the improvement of their economic and cultural lot;

c) To liberate them from the disabilities they laboured under.

The party, further, through its resolutions, in an open session at Pather Masjid, envisaged:

i) Property not to be confiscated on account of conversion of a person from one religion to another (It was a practice during Dogra rule);

ii) The recruitment to the administrative posts to be made in proportion to the population of various communities.

iii) Land revenue to be reduced;

iv) Recruitment to State Army to be opened to all communities;

v) Freedom of speech and expression to be guaranteed.

vi) Political prisoners to be released unconditionally.[36]

In the years to come the programme of the Muslim Conferene became more ambitious. As already mentioned the party set before it the goal of a fully representative and responsible government.

Support Base of the Party

The Muslim Conference emerged on the political horizon of the State as the champion of Muslim cause. In the beginning, its support base was confined to the middle and upper class sections of the Muslims. The party fought for the achievement of the rights of these sections, especially in the matter of government services.[37] Soon it made in roads into the other sections of the Muslim community and grew into a very popular organization. One of the more impressive pieces of evidence was party's spectacular success in the first ever elections to Praja Sabha, the Legislative Assembly.[38]

Electoral Performance

The first elections in the history of the State were held on September 3, 1934. The undisputed victor in the elections was the Muslim Conference whose candidates captured 16 out of 21 seats allotted to the Muslim community.[39] This represented almost 50 per cent of the 33 elected members of the State Assembly but a little more than 20 percent of the overall membership. There was reason for satisfaction in the Muslim Conference Camp at the respectable performance of the party in its first electoral test.

The first by-elections to the Legislative Assembly took place in 1937. It so happened that in October 1936, Sardar Budh Singh tendered resignation from his membership. His action was immediately followed by all the elected members of the all Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference, except Moulvi Mohammad Abdullah Vakil. Following the acceptance of these resignations, the government announced that the by-elections would take place in July, 1937. As a result of the elections, all but two candidates of the Conference were returned unopposed. In the

remaining two constituencies, Muzafarabad and Kathua, conference defeated its rivals so miserabaly that even the security deposit of the candidates was forfeited.[41]

The second elections to the State Assembly took place on May 30, 1938. The Muslim conference won 19 out of the twenty Muslim seats it contested. More than half of the constituencies returned its candidates unopposed. In the constituencies where its candidates were faced with cut throat contest with those candidates who stood as independent candidates,[42] the Conference completely routed them and the party continued as before to have its monopoly over the popular benches of the Assembly.[43]

The last elections to the State Assembly in the pre-independent Kashmir were held in January 1947. These elections were boycotted by the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference due to the large scale rejection of the nomination papers of its candidates.[44] In the ensuing vacuum, the Muslim Conference of Chowdhary Ghulam Abbas managed to bag 16 Muslim seats out of the 20 reserved for the community.[45]

Jamaat-e-Islami

To serve the cause of Islam in India, Jamaat-e-Islami Hind was founded in 1941 by seventy five prominent Muslims of India including Maulana Madoodi, Maulana Islahi and Afzal Hussain. On the advice of Dr. Mohammad Iqbal, Dar-ul-Islam (Headquarter)of Jamaat-e-Islamia Hind was established in village Jamalpur near Pathankot in Punjab. A branch of the new political outfit also came up in the Jammu city. mohammad Shafi was the moving force behind the creation of this branch and its other prominent member was Ghulam Ghause.[46] Many leading muslims of Jammu became the members of Jamaat-e-Islamia and they regularly attended the annual sessions of the party. Some Muslims from Kashmir also took a keen interest in the working of the party and attended its meetings as observers.[47]

On the eve of partition and independence Maulana Madoodi alongwith many other activists of the party migrated to Pakistan. The branch of Jamaat-e-Islami in Jammu was disbanded and Mohammad Shafi and other also went to Pakistan.

In the year 1952 Jamaat-e-Islami made its reappearance in the state of Jammu and Kashmir as a regional party. Saad-ud-Din, a school teacher was the brain behind this religio-political organization. Since

there was no organisation worth the name in existence in the state to work for the propagation of Islam, the need for organizing the Jamaat had become necessary.[48] As a result, the Jamaat was duly brought into being with a view to promote Islam as an ideal of life for the entire state of Jammu and Kashmir. After coming back to power in 1975, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah imposed a ban on the party. This ban was subsequently lifted in 1978. The Jamaat has its own constitution which has been in force since 1953.[49]

Organizational set Up

The organizational set up of the Jamaat is heirarchical in nature, controlled from above. It comprises the central, the provincial, the district, the tehsil and the basic units.

The central set up consists of (i) the Amir-e-Jamaat; (ii) the Central Majlis-e-Shura (consultative Body) and(iii) Qayum (General-Secretary). The leader of the Jamaat is known as the Amir-e-Jamaat. He heads the Jamaat. The Amir must be a man of high learning possessing deep knowledge of the Quran and Sunnah. He must be an embodiment of extremely high calibre and god fearing, a man of wisdom, foresight, integrity, decisiveness and determination.[50]

The Amir is an elected head of the Jamaat. He is elected for a term of three years by Majlis-e-Namiadgam, an eighty member committee constituted for the purpose.[51] The Amir is eligible for re-election. The same person may be elected the Amir as many times as the members of Majlis-e-Namindgan desire.[52]

Central Majlis-e-Shura

The Central Majlis-e-Shura is an important organ of the Jammat. This seventeen member body is also elected by Majlis-e-Namiadgam for a period of three years. Its main function is to assist and advice the Amir-e-Jammat in the discharge of his functions and exercise of his powers. The members of the Shura are distinguished persons in the Jamaat. They possess high knowledge and have deep understanding of the Quran. They are known for qualities of honesty, integrity, wisdom, foresight and they fear God and, also love him. They must have a good deal of understanding of the Islamic movement.[53]

Qayum-e-Jamaat

The Qayum-e-Jamaat (General Secretary) is appointed by the Amir-e-Jamaat is consultation with the Shura. The General Secretary's main

function is to supervise and ensure successful working of all the departments of the Central organization. He is responsible to enforce discipline in the Jamaat. He keeps the Amir-e-Jamaat informed of all the Jamaat affairs.[54]

Provincial Set Up

The provincial set up is headed by the provincial Amir-e-Jamaat. He is appointed by the Amir-e-Jamaat for a term of three years. The provincial set up has a Majlis-e-Shura which consists of the maximum ten members. It performs the same functions within its jurisdiction as are performed by the Central Majlis.[55]

District Set Up

The district set up consists of the District Amir, his Secretary and the District Majlis-e-Shura. The District Majlis-e-Shura is appointed by the Provincial Amir-e-Jamaat, like the provincial, the District set up has a District Majlis-e-Shura.

Below the district set up is Tehsil set up which is also in the nature of higher bodies. The last set up in the heirarchy is the basic unit known as the local set up. Both the Tehsil set up and the local set ups have their respective Amirs and Secretaries. The deal with the affairs within their own jurisdictions.[56]

Ideology of Jamaat-e-Islami

The Jamaat is basically a fundamentalist outfit and it calls for going back to the fundamentals of Islam.[57] The Jamaat holds the conviction that 'there is no deity but Allah and Mohammad is His Prophet. According to this conviction, Allah is absolute, the only creator, disposer of all affairs and the only law giver in the voluntary and involuntary aspects of life.[58]. It means that God is the only true ruler, possessing the real power. His power is overlasting, sovereignty resides in Him alone and legislative authority rests with Him alone. Man is accountable for all his acts of omission and commission to God Almighty. Man should follow divine guidance in all walks of life - social, economic and political and reject everything or any way that runs counter to it. For achieving the objectives of good life, man should mould his life and conduct according to the command emanating from the prophet. The Prophet is the only true source of guidance after the Quran. Therefor, the Quaran and Summah (the way of life of prophet) go together and provide the best guidance and leadership to be followed by mankind. Man shoiuld apply the criterion

supplied by God to distinguish between good and bad, right and wrong and just and unjust. Requirement of good life can be met only when the Din is established. The term 'din' is very comprehensive. It includes man's inner and outer life and his individual as well as social life. It provides solution to temporal problems of mankind. The practical specimen of din is found in the life example of Prophet Mohammad and the caliphs. Hence a plea for the establishment of Nizam-i-Mustafa.[59]

Jamaat-e-Islamia believes that such a Nizam-i-Mustafal or socio-economic and political system can be established only by peaceful and non-violent means. The party does not subscribe to armed revolution for the achievement of political goals. It has declared its belief in democratic and constitutional methods for bringing about any kind of revolution. It does not believe in the mischief or riots on the earth. Jamaat is committed to the establishment of an Islamic state.[60] Islamisation of the state means the establishment of a system in which an individual is required to conduct his social, economic and political life according to the principle and tenants of the Quaran and sunnah. It believes that religion and politics are not two things. They are two faces of the same thing. According to Pir Sad-ud-Din, "Religion serves man's Soul, politics serves man's body. Body and soul make a man".[61]

The Jamaat favours parliamentary democracy as a form of Government. Since this form of Government is, more or less, in accordance with the accepted principles of Islamic democracy, the Jamaat has agreed to work for it for the achievement of its political, social and economic programme in the state. Like other democractically - oriented political parties, the Jamaat believes in peaceful and constitutional methods for bringing about any change. The party wants to bring about the desired changes through missionary activities, education and argumentation rather than through violent methods of force or war. That is the reason that the Jamaat's politics and religion go together "there is no dichotomy between religion and politics according to Islam."[62]

Programme of Jamaat-e-Islami

From 1952 to 1971 the Jamaat-e-Islami remained aloof from active politics in Kashmir. During this period the Jamaat had not only consolidated its position in the state but it also had prepared its well trained, dedicated and truthworthy cadres for political purposes. By 1972, the Jamaat was in a position to fight elections to the State Legislative Assembly. The Jamaat's participation in the election contest revealed automatically its political character.[63]

Jamaat-e-Islami believes in establishing a truely responsible government in the state on the principles of Islam.[64] The most important issue in Kashmir politics has been the issue of accession of the state to India. The Jamaat is of the opinion that Jammu and Kashmir state is a disputed state. The accession of the state to India is temporary and, as such, subject to the ratification by the people. This condition has, the Jamaat holds, been recognised by the United Nations also. On this basis the Jamaat-e-Islami maintained that the people of Kashmir still retain the right of self-determination. To determine the issue of accession by the people themselves is a right which the Government of India should concede to them so that Kashmir issue is resolved once for all. "The right to self-determination is a basic thing," claims the Jamaat, "who can deny it? Any person at any place has a right to self-determination. Be it Kashmir or elsewhere.[65] Hence, unless and until the Kashmir issue was decided according to the wishes of the people of the State, India has no right even to convene any conference or hold any meet or organise any sport of international level on the territory of Kashmir. It was on this contention that on October 12, 1983 Syed Ali Shah Geelani leader of the Jamaat state legislative party reiterated at a press conference that the International cricket Match between India and West Indies was illegal as it was held on the disputed territory of Kashmir state. Since the Kashmir issue was unresolved, the Syed added, the match amounted to a blatant violation of International law.[66]

Jamaat does not agree with the concept of secularism as propounded by the Indian politicians. The secular system according to Jamaat neither allows Islam to flourish nor ensures safety and security of life of Muslims in India. Syed Ali Shah Geelani, the supreme of Jamaat believes that any system divorced from religion tends to be tyrannical. Once he said that even Ram Rajya would be far better for Muslims than the present Indian system.[67]. According to Jamaat, the Indian leadership has not been able to change a man or society as a whole. The problem of communalism in India is the same as it had been in pre-independent era. The post-independent period in India has been witnessing frequent communal riots and the government has failed to prevent them. Thus, the securalism in India has become more a slogan, a propaganda or a window showpiece. According to Saad-ud-Din, "If they (Indians) explain their secularism by word and deed, we may even convert to it."[68]

Though Jamaat-e-Islamai claims to believe in non violence but in practice it tends to draw inspiration from the militant tendency. Its youth

wings and the militant organisations believe in militancy and at times instigate violence. The organisations such as Mahaz-e-Azadi, Peoples League, Jamaat-e-Tulba, Tafusal Islam have a militant character.[69]

The Jamaat, like other political parties, offers a well-thoughtout socio-economic and political programme. A study of its election manifesto reveals that the Jamaat stands committed.[70]

(i) To play a forceful and fearless oppositional role in the Assembly till it has assumed the power to rule.

(ii) To play an effective oppositional role in the Legislature with a view to end the political uncertainity in the state and to ensure the preservation of its identity.

(iii) To expose all such conspiracies in and outside the legislature as would, dangerously and unconstitutionally, be practised to convert the Muslim majority character of the state into minority one and oppose any such measure as will permit the settlement of non-state subjects in the state.

(iv) To present its constructive suggestions for the purpose of bringing about good relations between India and Pakistan and, in this respect, pursue both the countries to settle down all their disputes amicably for ensuring a peaceful future.

(v) To continue its efforts to make Jammu and Kashmir a welfare state and to strongly oppose all such measures as will damage the character and injure the faith of the people thereof. The Jamaat pledges to organise the people of the state against all evils such as manufacture of wine and its sale, unethical programmes of radio, television and cinema, bhung cultivation, unsound educational curriculum, obscene literature, and a system of co-education and co-employment. The Jamaat, also, pledges to vigorously fight against any cultural aggression.

(vi) To oppose all the black laws which empower the government to curb the freedom of innocent people and place restrictions on political parties without trial.

(vii) To continue its struggle for the eradication of such laws as are deterimental to the freedom of speech, expression and the press.

(viii) To protect the rights of the minorities and to strengthen brotherhood and communal harmony in the state.

(ix) To offer constructive proposals in favour of labourers, for the development of fruit industry, establishment of large scale industries, job opportunities for unemployed and abolition of beggary.

(x) To continue its struggle for the protection of the rights of peasants.

Support Base

The Jamaat is a well knit, well organised and extremely disciplined politico-religious organisation. It has developed an infra-structure for widening its base and preaching its ideology in almost all the areas of the Kashmir valley."[71] The party also maintains its provincial headquarters in Jammu. The party has also extended its activities to the far flung hilly areas of Doda and Rajouri districts.

The party draws its followers mainly from the middle class sections of the Muslim community. Its militant cadres come from younger generation of Muslims. It also draws its followers from government officials and academic circles. It has its strong holds in educational institutions: Colleges and universities. The Jamaat has at present the most dedicated cadre of a substantial number of young Muslims. All of them are well versed with the knowledge of the Holy Quran and the Sunnah. They are also equipped with modern education both in sciences and arts.[73]

In early 1960's Jamaat established a network of schools under a separate trust with the objective of spreading its influence. The product of these schools further inflate its support base. The party is also running a weekly Azhan, a daily Uqab and monthly Takbeer[74] as part of its propaganda campaign. In addition, it has been running general study circles in different parts of the valley which, as reported, are being financed with the help of huge petro-dollars recovered from Arab countries in the name of spreading Islamic culture.[75] In short, such activities of the party have helped in further broadening its support base.

Electoral Performance

Fundamentalist Jamaat-e-Islamia jumped into electoral battle for the first time in 1972.[76] The party contested for 22 seats and was able to win five. In 1977 elections Jamaat-e-Islami contested for 19 seats but it did not improve its percentage of votes polled. It secured only one seat from Sopore where the party chief Syed Ali Shah Geelani himself contested.

In 1983, the party contested for 26 seats but could not win a single seat and was completely routed. Though the party was very popular in areas like Baramulla, Anantnag and Pulwama districts, it did not fare well in the elections there also.

In the quest of achieving its goal of capturing political power, the Jamaat entered into an alliance of like minded religious groups operating in the Kashmir valley. The outcome of the alliance was the formation of united Muslim Front in September 1986. Besides Jamaat-e-Islami, the Front included umat-e-Islamia, of Qazi Nissar, Muslim Itthad of Maulana Abbas Ansari, People's Conference of Abdul Ghani Lone and National Conference (Khalida faction).[77] Although it joined the Muslim United Front, the Jamaat maintained its separate identity and used the banner of the new outfit only for fighting the elections to the state legislature. At the time of the formation of MUF, Qazi Nissasr was made its Convener,. After assuming his office, Qazi Nissasr declared, "We are interested in the restoration of democratic rights to the people, both Muslims and non-Muslims living in the state, India that claims itself to be the biggest democracy of the world has deprived the people of this state of their democratic rights since 1947.[78] The March 1987 assembly election was described by the Front as a contest between 'Islam and Securalism'.

To the question as to why the Jamaat-e-Islami joined hands with other fundamentalist forces to form the Muslim United Front, the respondents came out with the replies as reflected in the following table :-

TABLE NO. 8

Reasons for joining hands with other religious groups to form MUF	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. To oppose the Rajiv-Farooq accord and coalition government formed by National Conference(F) and Congress(I)	29	41.43
2. To strengthen anti-Indian forces in the State	19	27.14
3. To preserve and protect the Muslim character of the State	17	24.28

Reasons for joining hands with other religious groups to form MUF	No. of Persons	Percentage
4. To fight for cessation of the State from the Indian Union	2	2.86
5. Expressed their ignorance	3	4.29
	70	100

During the election campaign, the Front leaders described the politics as an inseparable part of religion and saw shrines as effective power centres.[79] They asked for the Holy Quran as the symbol for their party in the elections but it was denied to them by the Election Commission.[80] Strangely the issue of accession was not raised in the election manifesto.[81] During the course of their fierce battle against the Congress(I) and the National Conference, the front leaders warned the voters and said, "If they (Muslims) do not vote for the Front they will get the blame that Muslims in Kashmir had voted against Islam."[82] Dr. Qazi Nissar said, "This is a fight for the restoration of the rights of the Kashmiri Muslims." The real danger is from Brahman Samrajya. "We want to fight this imperialism."[83] The cassettes played in the election campaign glorified Islam and spoke of Nizam-e-Mustafa.

During the election with the exception of Qazi Nissar and Abbas Ansari, the Front virtually remained a Jamaat affair. A study of Party affiliations of those who had filed nominations as Front candidates would also reveal that Jamaat had taken a quota of 24 seats on its name and 16 other constituencies in the name of its satellite organisations.[84] In all, the Front contested 53 assembly seats during that election.

In terms of seats the United Muslim Front though could win only four seats yet it mustered 32 percent of the varied votes. Apart from this, it lost in three constituencies by narrow margins; in Bijbehara by 100 votes, in Wachi by 122 votes, and in Shopian by 336 votes. It may also be mentioned here that the number of rejected votes in these constituencies were 1177, 1703 and 1122 respectively. It exceeded the margin of victory of National Conference candidates.[85]

In the month of July 1989, Jamaat-e-Islami, the main constituent of Muslim United Front virtually opted out of the election politics when the general body of the party unanimously decided not to seek registration

with the election commission of India. This decision was in response to Election Commission's notification asking all the political parties to include in their constitutions the clause that they believed in securalism and socialism.[86] The party also decided not to take part in the forth coming Lok Sabha elections for the same reason.[87] The Jamaat claimed that its constitution had been drafted strictly in accordance with the guidelines of Holy Quran and Sunnah and it could not make any amends in it as that would amount to the violation of the principles of Islam for the propagation of which the party stood for.[88] It was also contended that the conditions of registering the party with the Election Commission and taking oath of allegiance to secularlism and socialism, as provided in the amended provisions of election laws, could not be acceptable to Muslims, whose belief was that the Islam and only Islam was a complete way of life in all respects and no ism can be attached with it.[89]

In the light of the stand taken by Jamaat-e-Islami, the Muslim united Front decided to direct its members in the Legislative Assembly to resign from their seats. Decision to this effect was earlier taken at the specially convened meeting of the Majlis-e-Shura, the highest decision making body of the Front.[90] In response to this directive three of the four members of the front tendered their resignations to the speaker of the State Legislative Assembly on August 30, 1989. The fourth member of the front Abdul Razak refused to oblige the party leadership on the plea that he wanted time for consulting the voters on whose support he had entered the Legislative Assembly.[91]

TABLE NO. 9

Electoral performance of Jamaat-e-Islami (Now Part of MUF)

Name of the Party	Year of Election	Seats Contested	Seat Won	Percentage of votes polled
1. Jamaat-e-Islami	1972	22	5	7.18
2. -do-	1977	19	1	3.57
3. -dio-	1983	26	Nil	3.41
4. M.U.F.	1987	53	4	32.0

Plebiscite Front

The card of 'Plebiscite' has always between played by secessionist and separatist groups for deciding the future of the state of Jammu and Kashmir. Among the catalysts of the demand for plebiscite in the state, the 'plebiscite Front' requires a special consideration in view of the popularity it had gained among those elements condemning state's accession to India.

Inspite of the fact that Congress leadership in India and the leadership of National Conference in the State had found an identity in their approaches and objectives in so far as their freedom struggle was concerned and adopted a similarity of views and strategies with regard to the politics of government, they were unable to adjust their political objectives and co-ordinate their political operations in the post-independence era. Thus, beneath the stable political facade there was a marked simmering discontent and disappointment at each other's performance.[92] The politics of conflict further depended when Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, the Prime Minister of Kashmir, asserted Kashmir sub-nationalism while denying the finality of the accession of the state to India in his Ranbir Singh Pura speech in 1953.[93] The situation reached a point of no return because of subsequent speeches made by Sheikh Abdullah at Hazratbal and other places in the valley challenging India's interference in the Kashmir affairs, coupled with this, there were alarming reports that Sheikh Abdullah was thinking of declaring Kashmir as an independent country, the idea of which was said to be mooted by Mr. and Mrs. Henderson and Stevenson.[94] During his visit to Kashmir in May 1953, Stevenson is reported to have promised support to this move.[95] There were also reports that serious difference had cropped up in the cabinet of Sheikh Abdullah, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammad, the next senior party man and the Deputy prime Minister alongwith Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq, Sham Lal Saraf and D.P. Dhar met Sadre-e-Riyast and expressed their lack of confidence in Sheikh Abdullah by levelling charges of corruption, maladministration, mismanagement and nepotism.[96] Consequently Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was dismissed on August 9, 1953 by Sadre-e-Riyast on receiving green signal from Delhi.[97]

The arrest of Sheikh Abdullah gave a new turn to Kashmir politics and this event was termed as an attack on the Sub-nationalism of Kashmir by the Indian government.[98] The arrest received violent reaction by the people of valley and it was a shock even to Sheikh Abdullah and his close

friends.[99] Under the circumstances a movement was expected to be launched by the leadership which could moblize the Kashmir sub-nationalist sentiments.

There was need for an organisation also to impress upon all concerned the urgency of a peaceful settlement of the Kashmir question.[100]

The idea was given a practical shape by Mirza Afzal Beg who, having been released from detention in November 1954 due to his illness, founded the Jammu and Kashmir Plebiscite Front on August 9, 1955.[101] Six members of the state legislature and one member of the parliament helped Mirza Afzal Beg in his endeavor. Mirza Afzal Beg became the President of the Front with G.H. Hamadani as Secretary.[102] The Plebiscite Front had the blessings of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah which helped it to become a popular organization in view of his historic role in the freedom struggle.[103] Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah did not formally join the Plebiscite Front and acted as its patron only.[104]

The Plebiscite Front was hardly three months old when, on 19 November, 1955, Mirza Afzal Beg alongwith several top leades was arrested under the preventive detention Act. The arrest of leaders dampened the spirit of the followers but the pressure was kept up by the party workers. The state wing of the Praja Socialist Party, the Kashmir Political Conference, the Kashmir Democratic Union and the Kisan Mazdoor Conference all viewed with one another to pressurise the government into holding the Plebiscite but their efforts made no headway.[105]

A two day convention of the Plebiscite Front workers was held at Anantnag in the last week of November 1955. Inspite of high handedness of the state government more than fifty thousand people attended the convention. Several resolutions were passed in which government of India was asked to implement the U.N. resolutions on Kashmir and honour her solemn pledges of holding free and partial Plebiscite in Kashmir for the democratic settlement of the accession question. But the party could not hold a third convention successfully as the state governments' police action dispersed all those who were attending the convention in Pulwama in December, 1955.[106] Between 19 November, 1955 and 29 September, 1956 four Presidents including Mirza Afzil Beg of the Plebiscite Front were arrested. On October 3, 1956 the new President, Mr. Vakil, gave an undertaking on behalf of the Plebiscite Front, that its fight for a free Plebiscite would be continued strictly along constitutional lines.

On the enquiry as to why such a large number of people particularly from the Kashmir valley gave a wholehearted support to the party, the respondents mentioned the following factors.

TABLE NO. 10

Reasons for the popularity of Plebiscite Front.	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. Its demand for the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir	30	43.86
2. Its Pro-Sheikh and anti Indian attitude	20	28.57
3. Because of its Muslim character	15	21.43
4. Do not know	5	7.14
	70	100

On October 19, 1956, the state government released Mirza Afzal Beg and other leaders of the Plebiscite Front from various jails to enable them to participate in the Assembly proceedings.[107] Mirza Afzal Beg and his close associates like Mubarak Shah, Mirza Ghulam Mohammad Beg, Hakim Hbibullah and Kh. Ghulam Rasool Raina all members of the constituent assembly took advantage of their presence in the house and in a joint statement explained their view points on the basic issue of accession and constitution. They declared that they felt duty bound to boycott the proceedings of the constituent Assembly. On October 34, 1956, Beg addressed the Assembly and reminded the government of India of its solemn commitments about plebiscite.[108] The boycott and speeches of the Front leaders created a very unpleasant situation for the state government which acted swiftly and arrested Afzal Beg and other leaders after a brief respite of our days and within twenty four hours of the boycott. Thousands of telegrams were sent from the Plebiscite Front Committees to the President constituent Assembly, to desist from constitution making. Protest meetings were held where the members reiterated their faith in the right of self-determination.[109]

Although the party ceased to be an opposition party in the Assembly in view of the boycott of the Assembly elections, the role of the party played outside the assembly had been such an important and major factor

in determining the policy of the government vis-a-vis opposition that it would not be exaggeration of the fact that all opposition politics of the state was the politics of the Plebiscite Front.[110]

The Plebisicite Front, then became a party more of pro-Pakistan elements rather than being a secular party as was claimed earlier. At the ideological level, for the first time in the political history of Kashmir, Mohd. Ali Jinah was sought to be rehabilitated and got tributes on the pages of the "Front."[111] The political appeals were addressed exclusively to Muslims.[112] In 1958 when Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah was for the first time released from jail, the tone of the speeches delivered by him became a matter of concern for the Indian government. On January 31, 1958, he branded Pakistan a friend and India its enemy.[113] The Hazaratbal incident (21st of February 1958) which resulted in a communal frenzy a few minutes after Aheikh Mohd. Abdullah had addressed a congregation of 2,50,000 people invited news captions like "Plebiscite Front again indulges in Holliganism." (Hindustan Times 25.2.1958); "Second attack by pro-Pak elements - Incidents in Srinagar" (The Times of India 25.2.1958) with some facts hidden behind the scene.114

Meanwhile, the revelations made by B.N. Malik in his capacity as head of the Intelligence Bureau were alarming. Various documents seized from the Plebiscite Front, it was claimed, disclosed the regular contacts between the Plebiscite Front leadership and the Pakistan agencies. The incriminating letters recovered from Mirza Afzal at the time of his arrest in 1956 had disclosed that regular communication was being maintained between the War Council of Pakistan and Plebiscite Front leaders including Sheikh by means of couriers.[115] Although the case, popularly known as the Kashmir conspiracy case, was withdrawn in 1963 in the larger national interest, the tendency the Plebiscite Front was approaching very much anti-Indian.

The Holy relic episode of 1963 provided an other opportunity to the Plebiscite Front to give expression to its followers. The party forged an alliance with the Awami Action Committee of Maulvi Farooq to lead the people of valley in this hour of grave crisis. The alliance, however, broke down after the recovery of the Holy - relic as the two parties failed to reach an agreement as to who would preside over the reception ceremony.[116] The Holy-relic theft and the consequent rise of Awami Action Committee stole some of the thunder out of the Plebiscite Front. No longer Plebiscite Front could claim that it was the sole representative of the Muslims of Kashmir.

Failure of Pakistan to capture the state with the help of large scale infiltration in 1965 gave rise to extremism in the Kashmir valley. Youth leaders accused the Plebiscite Front of inaction when Pakistan was trying to 'liberate Kashmir'. On October 1, 1965, during a meeting at Hazaratbal shrine several students captured the dias and blamed the leadership of Front for being stooges of the Indian government.[117] From then the grip of the extremist youth on the Plebiscite Front tightened. The extent of this swing was demonstrated during September and October 1967, when the students launched an agitation in Srinagar which spread to the whole valley of Kashmir.[118] Extensive rioting and destruction of property was accompanied by demands for Plebiscite. This agitation by pro-Pak elements was an important factor contributing to the release of Sheikh Abdullah in early January, 1968.[119]

The President of the Plebiscite Front, Mirza Afzal Beg had launched the Plebiscite Movement with great zeal and spirit but the lack of accessibility to the mass sentiments and Indian leadership's reason made him set a well-defined boundary beyond which the movement could go except in case of perishing itself. The policy of reconsideration in late 1960's on the part of the leadership of the Plebiscite Front slackened the process of the Plebiscite Movement. Plebiscite was disbanded in 1975 in the wake of Kashmir Accord signed by Indira Gandhi and Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah.

Organisational Structure

Since Plebiscite Front had its roots in the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, the party retained for itself the same organisational structure.[120]

Starting from below, the primary members of the party elected a Gram (Village) Front Committee in each village. Each Gram Committee had an elected President, a Secretary and a treasurer. The Gram Committees in a Patwar (circle) elected a Patwar Committee in rural areas while in urban areas there were Halka Committees. The Patwar and Halka Committees then elected their delegates to the Block Committee, one delegate for each group of five hundred members. The delegates of the Block Committees, in turn, elected zonal committee the next higher tier of the party. The delegates of each region/province of the state then elected the regional/provincial committee of its office bearers. Finally emerged the General Body of the party. The General Body of the party was elected by the regional/provincial delegates. Each group of five

delegates elected one member for the General Body. The General Body of the party as well as the delegates elected the party president, who in turn nominated the Vice-President, the General Secretary and the Treasurer of the Party. In addition, he appointed the Working Committee which constituted the apex of the party.[121]

Aims and Objectives

The Plebiscite Front had two sets of objectives. It had a long term objective of launching a "New Kashmir Programme"[122] inherited by it from National Conference.

The short term objective of the party had been confined to the exercise of right of self-determination by the people of the state to decide their future. The party adopted the "self-determination" as the objective "to keep the people on the proper rails of correct political thinking...to arrest the communal and fissiporous tendencies."[123] The Front leaders declared that 'self-determination' was a sort of "Panacea for all political ills."[124] The party did not recognise any legal set up regulating and finalising state's status. It believed in the right of the Kashmiri people to decide their future.

Support base of the Plebiscite Front

The Plebiscite Front had an early success and it gained strength with the passage of time.[125] It received unreserved backing and support from the elements who were not reconciled to the idea of Kashmir's accession to India. It attracted the elements having affinity with the principle of Kashmiri sub-nationalism represented by Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, those having ideological affinity with the Two Nation Theory and were not prepared to sacrifice their religion and ideology at the alter of good relationship with India and who cherished the idea of independent Kashmir.[126]

Plebiscite Front Vis-a-Vis Elections

The Plebiscite Front leadership condemned the contesting of the elections as "contrary to the fundamental principles of the Front,"[127] and criticised those who wanted to enter the election arena and adviced them to keep away from the elections.[128] In the initial stage, the party felt that only by boycotting the elections the Indian government could be made to understand that Kashmiris demanded an urgent solution to the Kashmir problem. But later on apprehending cracks[129] in its ranks on this issue, the Plebiscite Front decided to contest the elections to "prove to the world how popular the front was in Kashmir."[130]

The Plebiscite Front, decided to enter the election field to end the misrule of the Sadiq government in 1972. But the congress government did not want to take the risk considering the bad plight the congress supported candidate had to face at the hands of the Plebiscite Front supported..... Shamim Ahmad Shamim - an independent candidate in the last parliamentary elections. The nomination paper filed by the Front candidates were rejected on the ground that they were anti-national.[131] However, a few candidates enjoying the support of the Front contested the elections. These included Mirza Arif Beg, Mufti Mehraj Din and Aga Syed Afzal Jalali.[132] Even the party is reported to have extended support to the candidates of Jamaat-e-Islamia.[133]

Although the Party could not participate formally in any of the elections the state conducted, its massive victory in the civic polls gave legitimacy to the stand of the Front that it had stronghold over the minds of the Kashmiri people.[134]

Awami Action Committee

Holy Relic, the hair of Prophet Mohammed, was brought to Kashmir in 1700 A.D. by a person known as Medanish.[135] This Relic was enshrined in the Mosque of Hazratbal and since then it is held in high esteem by the Muslims of Kashmir.

On December 27, 1963, the Holy Relic was stolen after breaking open the special room where it was lodged. The news of disappearance of the Relic spread like wildfire and caused widespread dismay and anger among the people.[136] Within minutes of the occurrence, thousands of people holding black flags came out en masse into the streets of Srinagar in defiance of the inclement weather and the rigours of biting cold and frost. The people, though grieved deeply, maintained age old communal amity and prayed for the recovery of the sacred Relic by holding mass congregations all over the valley.[137]

Popular discontentment generated among Kashmiri Muslims in the wake of Holy Relic episode became one of the most fatal movements in Kashmir politics and history. Separatist and secessionist sentiments were given a new expression and a climate of hostility against India was built in the name of religion.

The huge anti-government demonstrations which were held all over the valley paralysed the administration and ultimately proved to be an important factor in the change in political set up and leadership. Maulana

Syed Masoodi, who had at one time, been the general secretary of All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, then organised an All Party Action Committee dedicated to the investigation of the causes of the loss of the Holy Relic and to bring about its recovery. The Action Committee established branches in many parts of the valley out-side Srinagar and became a "coalition of opposition parties."[138] It contained elements from the Plebiscite Front and the followers of Mir Waiz Maulvi Farooq. Political Conference headed by Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din Karra also lent its support to the party.

Under the mounting pressure from the people, the Government of India took up the investigation of the theft of Holy Relic and sent a high powered team headed by intelligence bureau Chief B.N. Mullick to Srinagar to supervise the case. When strenuous efforts were about to bring the desired results, the Relic was restored to its place by some unknown man on January 4, 1964. There was widespread rejoicing all over the valley. The State and Central governments heaved a sign of relief.[139]

The Action Committee was used by its constituents for their respective purposes. Followers of Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah advocated the cause of independent Kashmir while as the supporters of Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din Karra and Maulvi Farooq clamoured for union with Pakistan. As the two traditional rivals; Sheikh Abdullah and Mir Waiz, were motivated to launch anti-India stir to get hold in the masses, they followed a policy of reconciliation. The new move of the two was to bring Pakistan as a party to the Kashmir issue equal to Kashmir and India. But whereas the Maulana Farooq, whatever his motives in securing the leadership during the agitation, remained the most introvert political personality surrounded in his own mask of political mechanics,[140] Sheikh Abdullah gathered a substantial political patronage both in India and Pakistan. An impression was created that Sheikh Abdullah held the key to the solution of Kashmir problem.

On June 20, 1964, there was a split in the Action Committee and Maulvi Farooq founded a new political outfit, "The Awami Action Committee'.[141] The differences between the pro-Sheikh and pro-Maulvi Farooq factions had crept in earlier on the day the two parties had not arrived at concensus as to who would preside over the 'reception ceremony' after the Holy Relic was recovered. Maulvi Farooq riding on the tide of time ignored, the offer of the Plebiscite Front to give chance

to Ghulam Rasool Kochak the then General Secretary of the Plebiscite Front to preside over the ceremony.[142]

The rise of the Awami Action Committee out of the Holy Relic crisis divided the area of influence among two major centrifugal opposition parties; the Plebiscite Front and the pro - Mir Waiz group. Sheikh Abdullah who had been using the undivided Action Committee as his political platform since his release suffered a set-back due to the split and described the newly formed Awami Action Committee as a mere forum and not a political party. Since the formation of Awami Action Committee, the relations between the supporters of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and the folllowers of Maulvi Farooq have been one of love and hate. The two outfits came close to each other on many occasions only to part company after some time.

Party Organisation

The organisational structure of Awami Action Committee consists of Mohalla Committees, Halka committees, Delegates Session and central body.[143]

Mohalla committee

The Mohalla Ccmmittee is the basic unit of the Awami Action committee organisation. The elections to Mohalla Committee are held every year. The basic members of the party living in a mohalla participate in the election. A Mohalla Committee comprises a President, a Secretary and a treasurer.

Halka Committee

The Halka Committee is above the Mohalla Committee. A Halka Committee consists of twenty to twenty five Mohalla Committees. Only the presidents of different Mohalla committees are the members of the Halka Committee. The Halka Committee elects its own president, Vice-President and the Secretary. The Halka Committee also elects delegates for the delegates session.

Delegate Session

Delegates session is held every year. Delegates elected by the Halka committees participate in this session. They elect the office bearer of central body of the Awami Action Committee.

Central Body

The central body is at the top of the structure of the party organisation. It consists of a President, a Vice-President, a General Secretary, a Publicity Secretary and a Treasurer. The central body is the most important organ of the party. It is the sole policy making body of the organisation. It chooses persons for the elections to the state legislature. The President of the central body is the chairman of the Awami Action Committee. Mir Waiz Maulavi Farooq is the life Chairman of the Party.[144]

Support base of the Party

Mirwaiz Maulvi Farooq, the Chairman of the Awami Action Committee represents the orthodox and conservative public opinion in the Kashmir valley. He is the religious head of a substantial sections of Muslims[145] and is held in high esteem throughout the Kashmir province. His Awami Action Committee has pockets of influence in down town area of Srinagar and in other major towns of Kashmir valley. Inspite of its influence it has never posed any real threat to the popularity of National Conference.

Ideology and Programme

Maulvi Farooq's Awami Action Committee was the first genuine pro-Pakistan party in Kashmir in the ideological sense of the team 'Pro-Pakistan'. From the very beginning Awami Action Committee had anti-India stance and it favoured outright union of Kashmir with Pakistan.[146] Moulvi Farooq on many occasions criticised Sheikh Abdullah for having committed a blunder by linking the fate of Kashmir with India."It was he who invited Indian army in 1947 for ensuring that he was installed as the ruler of Kashmir".[147]

The constitution of Awami Action Committee lays stress on the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir.[148] The rank and file of Awami Action Committee believe that they have been denied the opportunity to come in the Indian main stream and the people of Kashmir are suspects in the eyes of the Indian leadership.[149] At the same time the Party strongly favour the retention of Article 370 of the Indian constitution and regards this article as the basis of relationship with India. While addressing a congregation of Muslims at Jama Masjid on December 2,1989 Maulana Farooq declared that demand of certain elements in India to scrap Article 370 was fraught with dangerous consequences and

the day such a thing happened, it would be the end of the accession.[150]

To the question as to what are the main objectives of the Awami Action Committee, the researcher received the following replies from the respondents:-

TABLE NO. 11

Main objective of the Awami Action Committee	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. To fight for the right of the self-determination for the people of Jammu & Kashmir	8	11.43
2. Cessation of the State from the Indian Union	10	14.29
3. To provide political alternative to the National Conference	12	17.14
4. To protect the interests of Muslims of the State	20	28.57
5. Do not know	20	28.57
	70	100.00

Electoral Performance

After the split in the All Party Action Committee formed in the wake of Holy Relic episode and the parting of ways with the supporters of Sheikh Abdullah, Maulvi Farooq did not take an active part in the politics of Kashmir. He came out of his political slumber on the eve of 1977 Assembly elections and extended the support of his party to the Janta Party. Maulvi Farooq took this stand when Morarji Desai, the Indian Prime Minister personally came to him for support. While taking this decision, Mir Waiz had to, for a while, repudiate the policy of support for accession to Pakistan which only provided him strength.[151]

In the elections of 1983 Awami Action Committee put its weight behind the National Conference. Death of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah generated a sympathy wave in the supporters of Maulvi Farooq and they openly convassed for the National Conference and helped that party to get a comfortable majority in the State Assembly .[152]

Dismissal of Farooq Abdullah ministry in August 1984 was condemned by Mirwaiz Maulvi Farooq who described it as unconstitutional. On the eve of 1987 elections to the State Legislature Farooq Abdullah personally came to Maulana Farooq and sought his blessings and co-operation. During the talks Farooq Abdullah offered two seats to Awami Action Committee in exchange for electoral support. Maulana Farooq agreed to support National Conference and successfully fiellded his two nominees Mohammad Shafi Khan and Pir Mohammad Shafi from Idgah and Zadibal constitencies.[153]

The 1989 elections to Lok Sabha were, however, boycotted by Awami Action Committee. Addressing a Friday congregation at Jama Masjid Mir-Waiz Moulvi Farooq described the holding of Lok Sabha election in Kashmir as "big cruel joke" with the people of Kashmir in the background of what he called the denial of basic fundamental rights.[154] He further declared that the people of Kashmir had completely lost faith in "Indian democracy and justice" and therefore their participation in the process of elections was just a futile exercise.[155] By boycotting the elections to the Lok Sabha, Awami Action Committee reversed its earlier stand of extending support to National Conference. By this stand the party strengthened the hands of pro-Pakistan United Muslim front which had earlier decided not to take part in the elections to Lok Sabha.

All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad

The political movement that started in the Kashmir valley in 1931 under the leadership of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah could not sweep Jammu.[156] The National Conference failed in its efforts to extend its activities in Jammu region particularly in the Hindu dominated belts. Its genesis, growth and ideological moorings made it a suspect in the eyes of the Dogra Nationalists of Jammu who looked upon it as something alien and totally unacceptable.[157] The Hindus of Jammu had definite ideas as to how Kashmir should be ruled and they made no attempt to hide their feeling. Sheikh Abdullah's anti-Dogra bias and the Quit Kashmir Movement of 1946, which the Dogras of Jammu viewed as an attempt to eliminate their influence from Kashmir, made the National Conference an organization with no appeal for the Hindus of Jammu who would have liked Jammu rule Kashmir rather than vice-versa.[158] Few things could be more galling than to be ruled by those over whom one once ruled.[159]

Maharaja Hari Singh bade farewll to the Kashmir Valley on October 26, 1947 in the wake of the tribal attack and came to Jammu.[160] He

subsequently decided to leave the state for reasons of health and, therefore, entrusted to Yuvraj Karan Singh all powers and functions with regard to the State by appointing him Regent. The exit of Maharaja further developed a feeling of insecurity in the minority community. The aggressive trends in the Kashmiri nationalism, combined with the fear of political power passing into the hands of Kashmiri Muslims made the Dogras of Jammu feel politically ignorned and condemned.[161] Their feeling of resentment was further aggravated by Sheikh Abdullah's revolutionary plans for economic and social changes which adversely affected the economic interests of the majority of the people in the Jammu region.[162] They believed that they would enjoy greater security within the Indian union and therefore, demanded full integration of the state with India. In the back-drop of this situation it was decided to launch a movement to resist Sheikh Abdullah's designs and the programmes of National Conference. The movement took the shape of a political party called the Praja Parishad.[163]

The Praja Parishad came into existence in November 1947 and a group of R.S.S. workers took a leading part in its formation.[164] The first President of the Party was Hari Wazir and the General Secretary was Balraj Madhok. Hari Wazir was succeeded by Lala Roop Chand Nanda. The party gained strength with the adhesion of such stalwarts as Prem Nath Dogra and others. Very soon it virtually became the only representative party of the Jammu Hindus.[165] It also became the Principal Opposition Party of Jammu as well as the local instrument of its protest.[166] By 1951, the Party had excellent organization. It had scores of whole time workers. It was in close touch with Hindu Mahasabha, Ram Rajya Parishad and Jan Sangh. Although Prem Nath Dogra was the Principal figure of the Party its main local strength came from such influential Hindus as Ganga Ram, a former Home Minister, Nischint Singh, Rattan Singh and the former Inspector General of Police, Janak Singh.[167]

In answer to the question as to whether the Praja Parishad consisted of the persons having R.S.S. background and pro-Maharaja Hindu feudal elements, the respondents gave the following view points:-

TABLE NO. 12

Praja Parshid consisted of persons having R.S.S. background and pro-Maharaja Hindu feudal elements	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. Yes	40	57.14
2. In addition to R.S.S. and feudal elements there were some others who were critical of Sheikh abdullah's anti-Dogra and anti-Jammu pronouncement and were worried about the tendency to draw the state away from India.	10	14.29
3. Expressed Ignorance	20	28.57
	70	100

Party Organisation

The organisational structure of Praja Parshid consisted of Primary Samitis, Mandal Samitis, Tehsil samitis, District samitis, Provincial Samitis, General body and the Central Committee.

Primary Samiti

The primary Samiti was the basic unit of the Party. It consisted of twenty five or more Primary members of the party. The Primary Samiti consisted of a President, a Secretary and a Treasurer. All the office bearers were elected by the basic members.[168]

Mandal Samiti

The Mandal Samiti was above the Prtimary Samiti. For each group of Primary Samitis there was a Mandal Samiti. Members of the Primary Samitis elected the President of the Mandal Samiti. The President of Mandal Samiti himself nominated his executive consisting of a Secretary, a treasurer and six members. The Mandal Samiti supervised the working of Primary Samitis under it.[169]

Tehsil Samiti

All the members of the executives of the Mandals in a Tehsil jointly constituted a Tehsil Samiti. The Tehsil Samiti had an elected President,

at least two vice-president, a treasurer and nine members. They also elected two representatives for the General Body with the consent of President of the Tehsil Samiti. The Tehsil samiti was responsible for popularising the ideology of Praja Parshid in the Tehsil.[170]

District Samiti

All the Tehsil Samitis in a district joined their hands to constitute a District Samiti. All the members of Tehsil Samitis elected a President, a Secretary and an organisational secretary of the District Samiti of the Party. The President of the District Samiti, with the help of secretary and organisational secretary, constituted a fifteen members District Executive Samiti.[171]

Provincial Samiti

The Provincial Samiti was above the District Samiti. This was an elected body, representing the three regions of the state - Jammu, Kashmir and Ladakh. The Provincial Samiti looked after the organisational work of the Party in various regions.[172]

General Body

The General Body was above the Provincial Samiti. The General Body consisted of:-

a) The President, the Secretary and the Organisational Secretary of each Tehsil Samiti as well as the elected representatives from each party constituency.

b) The President, the Secretary and the organisational Secretary of the District Samiti.

c) Five members nominated by the President from the other institutions affiliated to the Party.

d) Each member of the General Body had to pay rupees five annually.[173] It was the main committee to run the policies of Praja Parshid. During its tenure it had the right to solve all the problems which might crop up. It had also the right to issue orders to other committees from time to time. The session of the General Body used to be held once a year.[174]

Central Committee

At the apex of the party heirarchy there was central committee consisting of twenty one members including the President. These

members were selected by the President from the members of the General Body. The president of the central committee also selected two vice-presidents, one secretary and one treasurer.[175] The central committee was responsible to the General Body. It used to issue orders regarding those questions which were not defined in the constitution. It worked to fulfil the aims of Praja Parishad.[176] The President of the central committee was the highest functionary of the Party organisation.

Membership

Any adult subscribed to the ideology of the Party could became its member by paying four annas as entry fee. This membership fee was later on raised to rupee one.[177]

Finances

Money collected from the persons who sought its membership, five rupees annual fee from each member of the General Body, donations received from different sources, as well as, money collected by selling tickets bearing the photos of its president, constituted the finances of the Party.[178] Expenditure incurred on various activities of the Party was met out of this fund.

Ideology and programme

The main objective of the Praja Parishad was to achieve full integration of Jammu and Kashmir state with the rest of India, like other acceeding states and safe-guard the legitimate democratic rights of the people of Jammu from the anti-dogra stance of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah government.[179] The Party considered Jammu and Kashmir state an inseparable and indivisible part of India. The Party articulated Jammu's discontent in the emotive slogan of "full accession" of the state to the Indian Union and abrogation of Article 370 of the Indian constitution that guaranteed it a special status. The Party stressed the deletion of Article 370 as soon as possible and described this objective as its first and foremost duty.[180] The Party tirelessly tried to unite the people of Jammu with a view to foiling the attempts of those who tried to take the state away from India.[181]

The Praja Parishad favoured the transfer of land to the tillers, but it also stood for proper compensation to the expropriated landlords in line with the provisions of the Indian constitution.[182]

The Party intended to establish a social order in which there was to

be no discrimination on account of religion, caste, colour and faith and to provide opportunities of progress to every man and woman.

Support Base

The formation of Praja Parishad was welcomed by the masses of Jammu who were repeatedly accussed by the National Conference leadership for the massacre of innocent non-Hindus in Hindu dominated areas of Jammu Province and they developed a feeling of deprivation and neglect due to the shift of political power from Jammu to the valley in which Hindu Maharaja of Jammu was reduced to a powerless head of the state.[184] Praja Parishad had solid support base in the Hindu dominated belts of Jammu where the majority of the population, after the expulsion and escape of many Muslims was Hindu. The Party also got a strong support from the refugees who migrated from West Pakistan as well as from the areas of the state illegally occupied by Pakistan. Economically it also got support from the group of wealthy people who, as the Maharaja's active supporters, once enjoyed the privileged position of landlords but who had been dispossed by land reforms.[185] Business class concentrated in the city of Jammu and small townships of Kathua, Udhampur and Reasi generated a lot of support for the Party.[186] Many Rajputs among the Hindus also extended support to Praja Parishad because they regarded the National Conference leadership as the destroyer of Rajput dynasty from the state.

By 1951, the party had become a power to reckon with in the Jammu Province although it failed to make any headway in the valley. Sheikh Abdullah's contention that Praja Parishad consisted of a few disgrunted individuals and that it lacked popular support, was not correct. The Party did command the support of a vast majority of state Hindus.[187] Korbel while supporting this view, pointed out that one Party of importance in Jammu was the Praja Parishad, the only one which was in any real sense the opposition Party to the one in power. - All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference.[188]

On the enquiry as to why the All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad failed to establish a foothold in the Muslim dominated areas of Jammu and Kashmir valley, the respondents expressed different views as reflected in the following table:-

TABLE NO. 13

Why All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad could not establish strong holds in the Non-Hindu belts of Jammu and Kashmir	No. of Persons	Percentage
1. Because the party was fighting for the protection of the interests of Hindu community of Jummu	20	28.57
2. It had the regional as well as communal outlook	30	42.85
3. The majority community was conviced that it was a party of feudal elements	10	14.29
4. Do not know	10	14.29
	70	100

Electoral Performance

Praja Parishad, as one of the most important rightist parties of Jammu and Kashmir, opposed the setting up of a separate constituent Assembly for the state. It favoured the application of Indian constitution to Kashmir.[189] Inspite of this stand a special session of the Party held on May 8, 1951 decided to contest the elections to the constituent Assembly of the state.[190] Because of the large scale rejection of nomination papers of its candidates, Praja Parishad decided to boycott the elections in protest [191] and blamed the government for having used unfair means.[192] The Party, inspite of its popularity and strong support base failed to enter the state assembly.

In 1957, when the elections to the first Legislative Assembly were held, the Party captured 5 seats, polling 26.09 percent of the valid votes. The election results provoked angry protests from the Party. Pandit Prem Nath Dogra, the President of Praja Parishad, complained that the ruling party had rigged the elections, and manipulated the situation so that it could get majority. He charged the government with unfairness, bungling and mismanagement.[193]

In the election of 1962, the Party failed to maintain its previous record and got only 3 seats with 14.47 percent of votes.

TABLE NO. 14

Electoral Performance of All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad[194]

S.No.	Year of Election	Seats contested	Seats won	Percentage of votes polled
1.	1951	29	Nil	Nil
2.	1957	21	5	26.9
3.	1962	25	3	14.47

Akhil Bharatiya Jan Sangh

Praja Parishad came into existence in 1947 and for 17 long years it maintained its separate identity as a regional party. The motivating idea behind a separate identity was that the party wanted to fight at the state level against the ruling regional party, the National conference.[195] The Praja Parishad had ideological affinity with Bharatiya Jan Sangh and both parties entered into a working arrangement with each other in 1954.[196] Death of Shayama Prashad Mukherjee and the resignation of Mauli Chander Sharma from the post of the General Secretary of the party created leadership vacuum in the Bharatiya Jan Sangh. The party started looking for a suitable person to lead the party at this critical juncture. Because of his integrity and leadership qualities Pandit Prem Nath Dogra, who was at that time President of Praja Parishad, was asked to become the President of Bharatiya Jan Sangh also. Since it was not technically possible without a formal merger of the two parties, it was decided to affiliate Praja Parishad with Jan Sangh, thereby enabling Pandit Prem Nath Dogra to become the President of the all India Party.[197]

In the early sixties the leadership of the Praja Parishad decided to discard the regional character of the party and merge with Bharatiya Jan Sangh. This change in attitude occured because of the feeling in the party that the objective for which the party acted on the regional basis had been partially achieved and that the state had almost completely merged with the Indian Union.[198] The formal merger of the two parties took place in 1964 and the Praja Parishad adopted the ideology and programme of the rightist party operating on the national level.

Organisational Structure

The state unit of the party had a four tier organisation consisting of Sthaniya Samiti (Local Committee) Mandal Samiti, District Samiti and Pradesh Working Committee.

Sthaniya Samiti

Sthaniya Samiti was the basic unit of the party. Members of every Sthaniya Samiti elected its working Committee which consisted of a President, a Secretary and four members. The Sthaniya Samiti was normally elected for every polling booth and its term was one year.[199] The election took place by the show of hands and all primary members in the area of a polling booth participated in the election.[200]

Mandaln Samiti

Next to Sthaniya Samiti was the Mandal level of Jan Sangh. Every Mandal had atleast five Sthaniya Samitis under its fold. All the elected members of Sthaniya Samitis in a Mandal elected a president, not more than two vice-presidents, a Secretary, not more than two Joint Secretaries and a Treasurer. The President of the Mandal nominated 14 members of the Mandal committee. These fourteen members alongwith 7 elected members, constituted the Working Committee of the Mandal. The Mandal Committee was charged with the responsibility of supervising the working of Sthaniya Samitis.

District Samiti

The District Samiti was above the Mandal Samiti. Elected members of at least three Mandal Samitis within a district elected the President, nor more than two vice-presidents, a secretary, not more than two Joint Secretaries and a treasurer. The maximum strength of a district Samiti was 31. The district Samiti was a very important unit of Jan Sangh in the state as it supervised and co-ordinated the working of Mandals in its area.[201]

Pradesh Working Committee

At the apex was the Pradesh Working Committee. It consisted of a President, nor more than three Vice-Presidents, a Secretary, not more than three Joint Secretaries and a Treasurer. These office bearers were elected by the Pradesh General Council which consisted of representatives from each municipal constituency of the state. Apart from the elected members, the President nominated other members of the Working Committee.[202]

Ideology and Programme

The object of the Bharatiya Jan Sangh was the building of Bharat on the basis of Bharatiya Sanskriti and Maryada as a political, social and economic democracy granting of equality of opportunity and liberty to individuals so as to make her a prosperous, powerful and united nation, progressive, modern and enlightened, able to withstand the aggressive designs of others and to pull her weight in the Council of Nations for the establishment of world peace.[203] The Jan Sangh stated its 'fundamentals' as "one country, one nation, one culture and the rule of law."[204] The party wanted to build a system based on the principles of Indian culture. It desired to preserve the age old values of Indian life.[205]

Support Base

All the erstwhile supporters of Praja Parishad provided support base to the state unit of Bharatiya Jan Sangh. It consisted of a dedicated cadre of R.S.S. workers, refugees from West Pakistan and displaced persons from the Pakistan's held areas of state such as Mirpur and Kotli and the business class in the city of Jammu and districts of Kathua and Udhampur.

Electoral Performance

As successor of Praja Parishad, Bharatiya Jan Sangh entered the election arena of the state in 1967. The party contested for three seats from the Kashmir valley and 26 seats from Jammu region. The party had only a partial success and it won three seats polling 16.45 percent of votes. The party failed to make a dent in the Kashmir valley. In 1972 elections the party contested 5 seats from the Kashmir valley and 27 from the Jammu region.[206] But could hardly improve its position, rather there was a drop in the percentage of votes polled (9.8). The party once again entered the state legislature with 3 seats. In 1977 election Jan Sangh merged with the Janta Party and thus contested the elections under their banner. As Jan Sangh was popular in the Jammu region it formed the nucleus of Janta Party in this region. Inspite of party's merger with Janta Party, 12 of its candidates contested election as part of the new Party and out of them 3 were declared elected. It was actually Jan Sangh, which gained heavily as compared to its position and performance in the previous election.[207]

TABLE NO. 15

Electoral Performance of Bharatiya Jan Sangh

S. No.	Name of the Party	Year of election	Seats contested	Seats won	Percentage of votes polled
1.	Jan Sangh	1967	29	3	16.45
2.	Jan Sangh	1972	32	3	9.84
3.	Jan Sangh (As part of Janta Party)	1977	12	3	10.78

Bharatiya Janta Party

On the national scene Jaya Prakash Narayan tried his best to establish a two party system. He wanted to create a strong political party which could provide alternative to Congress Party. As a result a number of parties merged together to form Janta Party in 1977. Bharatiya Jan Sangh was one of such parties. The Jammu and Kashmir wing of Jan Sangh also become a part of the new party.

Fall of Janta government headed by Morarji Desai in 1979 led to the disintegration of the party and a number of new political parties emerged out of it.[208] Formalising the parting of ways with Janta Party, delegates attending the convention called by Mr. L.K. Advani on April 6, 1980 constituted a new party which they christened Bharatiya Janta Party and elected with one voice Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee as its first President.[209] Mr. L.K. Advani, Sikander Bakht and Dr. Murlimanhor Joshi were elected General Secretaries of the new political outfit. The party adopted a separate constitution, a separate flag and a separate election symbol.[210] A section of erstwhile Jan Sangh led by Balraj Madhok, who had decided to maintain a separate identity at the time of the formation of Janta Party, decided to keep away from the Bharatiya Janta Party.

Consequent upon the formation of Bharatiya Janta Party out of the ruin of Janta Party, the erstwhile cadre of Jan Sangh in Jammu and Kashmir joined the new party.[211] Thakur Baldev Singh was made the President and Prof. Chaman Lal as the General Secretary of the state wing of Bharatiya Janta Party.

Organisational Structure

The state level structure of the party consists of (i)State Council, (ii) Working Committee.

State Council [212]

The State Council will be comprised of:

a) Representatives elected from the districts falling under its jurisdiction

b) Ten percent of the M.L.As elected out of the sitting party M.L.As.

c) Ten percent of the M.Ps elected out of the party's sitting M.Ps from the state. If their number is upto 3, all of them will be taken.

d) All the members of the state party council

e) All the ex- party presidents at the state level.

f) All the members of the state party Working Committee.

g) Leaders of the party in both the houses of the state legislature.

h) All office bearers of the regional committee

i) All the Presidents and General Secretaries of all the district Councils.

j) The leaders of the party in the metropolitan councils, muncipalities, town area committees and block committees.

Working Committee[213]

Working Committee of the party at the state level shall consist of the state party President and not more than 50 other members. Out of the 50, three shall belong to schedule caste and schedule tribe and three women. The President of the party at the state level shall be elected by the members mentioned in Sub-clause A, B and C of Art. 16 but in accordance with the rules set by the National Working Committee.

The president will not only preside over the meetings of the Working Committee but will also nominate its members including 5 vice-presidents, at the most three General Secretaries, 5 Secretaries and one Treasurer. Out of these office bearers there shall be atleast one woman and one schedule caste.

At the lower level the party organisational structure is somewhat similar to the organisational structure of Bharatiya Jan Sangh.[214]

Finance[215]

Finance for the party are raised from the following sources:

i) one rupee annual membership fee from the basic members.

ii) Ten rupees annual fee from the members of the State Council.

iii) Donations collected from the members on the death anniversary of Deen Dayal Upadhaya, the ex-President of Bharatiya Jan Sangh.

The money collected is utilized on the day to day activities of the party.

Ideology and Programme

The party expressed its commitment to five ideals - nationalism and national integration, democracy, positive securalism, Gandhian socialism, and a value-based politics.[216] It shows its faith in all democratic norms with the hope that it would attempt to create a consensus on all major national issues and compete with others where conflicting situations arise. As national consensus can not be based on mere struggle for power, it must be based on certain principles and national objectives.

As a believer in democracy, it would fight against all trends of fascism and, authoritarianism. Its commitment to positive secularism implies a rejection of what the congress has been advocating so far. It rejects the policy of appeasement towards any community and instead supports the idea of full protection to the life and property of the minorities.[217] It disowns the "communal" and "rightist" label struct on it and endeavours to project Bharatiya Janta Party as a party wedded to pragmatism."[218]

The Party accepts the doctrine of socialism but says that its socialism is inspired not only by Mahatama Gandhi and Jaya prakash Narayan but also by Deen Dayal Upadhaya.[219]

In the sphere of foreign policy, the party favours the path of genuine non-alignment and an independent foreign policy aiming at preserving world peace and promoting enlightened self-interest of the nation.[220]

Support Base

All the erstwhile supports of Praja Parishad and Jan Sangh in the State of Jammu and Kashmir became the members of Bharatiya Janta

Party. Among them were the active members of R.S.S., businessmen, feudal elements and the refugees who migrated from the west Pakistan and areas of the state occupied by Pakistan on the eve of independence and partition.

Electoral Performance

The newly created Bharatiya Janta Party made a disastrous debut in the elections to the State legislature in 1963. It fielded in all 27 candidates but none of them was able to enter the State Legislature. The party secured only 3.08 per cent of the valid votes which showed a steep fall in its popularity. In 1987 elections the party could manage only two seats - Jammu North and Hiranagar. The Party president Thakur Baldev Singh won the Hiranagar seat only after the election of Pt. Girdhari Lal Dogra, the old Congress war horse to the Lok Sabha.

TABLE NO. 16

Electoral Performance of Bharatiya Janta Party[221]

S. No.	Name of the Party	Year of election	Seats contested	Seats won	Percentage of votes polled
1.	Bharatiya Janta Party	1983	27	Nil	3.08
2.	-do-	1987	26	2	2.60

From the aforesaid analysis of the rightist parties in the state of Jammu and Kashmir it becomes abundantly clear that there is a clear cut demarcation between the political parties of Jammu region and that of the Kashmir valley in so far as their ideologies, aims and objectives, support basis and activities are concerned. The rightist parties of Jammu stand for the protection of politio-socio-economic interests of the people of Jammu. They believe that their destiny lies in close ties with India. The rightist parties of the valley, on the other hand, lay stress on safe-guarding the identity and rights of the Muslims of the State. They also want effective checks against the onslaughts of secular forces represented by India. They are so strongly mobilized and instigated against the chauvinistic tendencies of the Indian nationalism that they even advocate secession from the Indian Union. They preach Muslim fundamentalism

and make free use of Mosques for their activities. Where as the rightist parties of Jammu have their strong-holds in the Hindu dominated belts of Jammu region, their counterparts in the valley bank on the support of Muslims of the valley as well as the Muslim dominated belts of the Jammu region. The rightist parties in Jammu raise their funds from the membership fee as well as donations received from their patrons. The rightist parties of the valley, in addition to their internal resources, have been reportedly receiving huge funds in the shape of petro-dollars from Arab countries in the name of spreading Islamic culture. So far as organisational structure is concerned the rightist parties in both the regions differ to a large extent from each other.

FOOT NOTES

1. Gupta, Sisir,: Kashmir - *A Study in India - Pakistan Relations* Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1966, P.52
2. Teng, Koul,: *Constituional History and Documents* New Delhi, Light and Life Publishers, 1977, P.87
3. Ganai, Abdul Jabber,: *Kashmir National Conference and Politics* Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers Srinagar, 1984, P.2
4. Nargis, Nar Singh Dass,: *Tarik Jadid Dogra Desh* Jammu, Chand Publishing House, 1967, P.787
5. Gupta, Sisir, Op.cit.,P.52
6. Verma, P.S.; *The Muslim United Front*
   An article in Regional Political Parties in India by S. Bhatnagar and Pradeep Kumar (Delhi ESS ESS Publication, 1988, P.187.
7. The Statesman (New Delhi) June 11, 1947, P.3
8. Bhushan, Indu; *The Government and Administration of Jammu and Kashmir* : Desertation (unpublished) Lucknow University, 1942, P.137
9. Census Commission, Jammu and Kashmir State. Census of India, 1941;Jammu and Kashmir (Jammu, Ranbir Government Press 1943) P.15
10. Singh, Balbir,: *State Politics in India.* Delhi, Macmillon India Ltd., 1982, P.49
11. The Hamdard (Weekly) Srinagar, February 15, 1936, P.6
12. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: *Jammu and Kashmir* Mortinus Nijhaff/The Haque/1960 P.61
13. 'The National Demand', published by M.M.Syeed, Mujahid Manzil, Srinagar, 1938
14. Singh, Balbir,; Op.cit., P.49
15. Korbel, Josef,: *Danger in Kashmir* London, Princeton University Press, 1954, P.20
16. Ibid., P.20
17. Tikoo, P.N., *History of Kashmir* New Delhi, Light and Life Publishers, 1979, P.87

18. Bomzai, P.N.K.: *History of Kashmir* New Delhi, Metropolitan Book Ltd; 1962, P.722
19. Singh,Balbir,: Op.cit., P.61
20. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan,: Op.cit., P.61
21. Korbel Josef, Op.cit.,P.21
22. Bhushan, Indu,: Op.cit., P.136
23. Bomzai, P.N.K.,: Op.cit., P.723
24. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: Op.cit., P.65
25. Bomzai, P.N.K., : Op.cit., P.723
26. Singh, Balbir, op.cit., P.52
27. "Census Commission, Jammu and Kashmir State", Census of India, 1941; Jammu and Kashmir, Jammu, Ranbir Government Press 1943, P.341
28. Taseer, Rasheed,: *Tehrik-e-Hurriat-e-Kashmir.* Srinagar, Muhafiz Publishers, 1968. P.247, 248
29. Ibid., P.248, 249
30. Ibid. P. 249, 250
31. Ibid., P.253
32. Ibid., P.252
33. Ibid, P.254, 255
34. Ibid., P.257
35. Ibid., P.255
36. Ganai, Jabbar,:Op.cit., P.3
37. Tikoo, P.N.,:Op.cit., P.119
38. Hamdani, Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din,: *Kahan Kahan Se (Urdu)* Srinagar, Broca Press, 1949, P.21
39. Dalal Barjor,: *Jammu and Kashmir State Assembly* Asiatic Review, January,1935, P.147
40. Khan, G.H.,: *Freedom Movement in Kashmir* New Delhi, Light & Life Publishers, 1980, P.253
41. The Hamdard (Weekly) Srinagar, January 23, 1937, P.6
42. The independent candidates were the Muslim Conference rebels who were denied party tickets.
43. Khan, G.H. : Op.cit., P.254
44. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: Op.cit, P.71
45. Due to the boycott by the National Conference only 18,200 out of 607,419 voters went to the poll.
46. An interview with Ghulam Nabi Faridabadi, Ex-Amir of the party in Jammu province and member Majhis-e-Shura and Majhis-e-Namiandgan at his residence on 23.2.90.

47. Ibid.
48. Khan, G.H.: *Government and Politics of Jammu and Kashmir* Published by Miss Natasha, Rawalpora, Srinagar, 1988, P.460
49. Constitution of Jamaat-e-Islami Jammu and Kashmir, Srinagar, Falah-e-Aam-Press, 1969, Art.2
50. Ibid., Article 11
51. Interview with Ghulam Nabi Faridabadi, Op.cit.
52. Article 13
53. Articles 16, 17
54 Ibid. Article 50
55. Khan, G.H., : Op.cit., P.465
56. Khan, G.H., Ibid. P.465
57. Verma, P.S.,: *Regional Political Parties in India* New Delhi, ESS ESS Publications, 1988, P.191
58. Constitution of Jamaat-e-Islamai, Article 3.
59. Khan, G.H.,:Op.cit., P.466
60. Ibid., P.467
61. Lakshman,Nikhil,: *Trouble in Paradise* Illustrated Weekly of India, March 10, 1985, P.9
62. Farooq Rehmani, Chairman Peoples League, Interview with Nikhil Lakshman, Ibid.
63. Khan, G.H.,: Op.cit., P.468
64. Interview with Mohd. Razak Jamaat Legislator at the M.L.A. Hostel Jammu on 11.12.1989
65. Pir Saad-ud-Din, Amir of Jamaat-e-Islami, Interview with Nikhil Lakkshman.
66. Khan, G.H.;Op.cit., P.468
67. The Indian Express (New Delhi), April 9, 1987
68. Saad-ud-Din, Amir of Jamaat-e-Islamia, interview with nikhil Lakshman.
69. Verma, P.S.: Op.cit.,P.192
70. Jamaat-e-Islami election Manifesto, P.2-4
71. Verma, P.S.,: Op.cit., P.192
72. Interview with Abdul Razak,: Op.cit
73. Khan, G.H.,: Op.cit., P.460
74. "Anatomy of Secessionists," An article Jammu Panaroma (Weekly of Jammu) June 1987, P.22
75. Ibid., P.20
76. Qureshi, Z.M.,: *Election and State Politics of India* New Delhi, Sandeep Prakashan, 1979, P.62

77. Verma P.S.,: Op.cit., P.190
78. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) February 14, 1987.
79. See the Editorial, Daily Excelsior (Jammu)February 20, 1987
80. Verma, P.S.,: Op.cit., P.194
81. Ibid., P.195
82. Ibid., P.196
83. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) March 5, 1987.
84. Daily Excelsior (Jammu) February 20, 1987.
85. Verma, P.S.,: Op. cit., P.197
86. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) July 7, 1989, P.I.
87. During the course of interviews conducted by the scholar, majority of respondents pointed out that the real reason for the boycott of 1989 Lok Sabha elections by the Jamaat was the threat of militants of the Kashmir Valley.
88. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) July 7, 1989, P.1
89. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) August 1, 1989.
90. Times of India (New Delhi) September 22, 1989, P.1
91. Ibid.
92. Teng, Krishan Mohan,: *Kashmir's Special Status* Delhi, Oriental Publishers, 1975, P.71
93. Bomzai, P.N.K.:*A History of Kashmir* New Delhi, Metropolitan Book Co., 1973, P.722
94. Vigil - A Political Weekly edited by Manoranjan Guha, Delhi, Vol. 4, No.52, Saturday, February 13, 1953, P.5
95. Korbel, Josef,: Op.cit., P.237
96. Gundevia, Y.D.,: *The Testament of Sheikh Abdullah* Dehra Dun, Paslit and Palit Publishers, 1974 P.64
97. Bomzai, P.N.K., Op.cit., P.795
98. Saraf, Mohammad Yusaf,: *Kashmir's Fight For Freedom* Lahore, Ferozsons, 1979, P.124
99. Birdwood,: *Two Nations and Kashmir* London, Robert Hole Ltd., 1956, P.160
100. Shawal,Mohi-ud-Din,: *Kashmir Conspiracy Case* Srinagar, the All Jammu and Kashmir Legal Defence Committee Publication, 1960, P.50
101. Fazili, Manzoor,: *Kashmir Government And Politics* Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1982, P.47
102. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: Op.cit., P.228
103. Sheikh Abdullah did not become the formal member of the Party because of his desire to project himself as the spokesman of all the people of the state. Lockwood, Op. cit., P.272
104. Fazili, Manzoor,: Op.cit.,P.79

105. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: Op.cit., P.228
106. Shawal, Mohi-ud-Din,: Op.cit.,P.50
107. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: Op.cit.,P.228
108. See M.A. Beg,: "The written statement filed by Mirza Afzal Beg on October 4, 1960". Kashmir Affairs, Vol.7, September -October, P.41
109. Shawal, Mohi-ud-Din,: Op.cit.,P.77
110. Fazili Manzoor,: Op.cit.,P.79
111. Front, the official organ of the Plebiscite Front
112. See Balraj Puri and A.G. Noorani, "A Debate on Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah and Kashmir," Published by Balraj Puri, P.20
113. Times of India, February 1, 1958.
114. See for details of the Hazaratbal Case, Mirdula Sarabhai "Popular Demand of J&K State. Series No.1 call for impartial enquiry" (Pre & Post Hazratbal Incident)
115. Malik, B.N.,: *My Years with Nehru* New Delhi, Allied Publishers, 1971, P. 64, 65
116. An interview with Ghulam Mohammad Bhadarwahi at his residence on 24.12.1989
117. The Tribune (Ambala) October 21, 1965, P.2
118. The Tribune (Ambala) October 4, 1967, P.1
119. Lockwood, David,: *Sheikh Abdullah and the Politics of Kashmir* Asian Survey May, 1969, P.383-392
120. An Interview with Sheikh Ghulam Mohammad Bhadarwahi,: Op.cit
121. Ibid
122. New Kashmir Manifesto of 1944 was a programme which promised to provide the people of Kashmir 'national economic programme' of Socialist interpretation. It was under this programme that Sheikh Abdullah introduced Land Reforms in the State.
123. Written statement filed by Mirza Afzal Beg,: Op.cit., P.61
124. Shawl, Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din,: Op.cit.,P.10
125. Kak, B.L.: *Kashmir Problem and Politics* Delhi, Seema Publishers 1981, P.61
126. Shawl, Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din,:Op.cit.,P.50
127. The Statesman (Delhi) December 28, 1966.
128. Ibid.
129. Patriot (New Delhi) September 13, 1968.
130. The Dawn (Karachi) and Tie Times (London) November 5, 1970.
131. National Herald (New Delhi) March 26, 1972, P.6
132. Hindustan Times (New Delhi) March 18, 1972, P.5
133. The Indian Express (New Delhi) February 16, 1972.
134. An interview with Sheikh Ghulam Mohammad Bhadarwahi: Op.cit.
135. Mullick, B.N.,: Op.cit.,P.117

136. Bomzai, P.N.K.,: Op.cit., P. 801

137. Ibid. P. 801, 802

138. Lam Alastair: *Crisis in Kashmir: 1947 to 1966* London, Routledge and Kagan Pasul, 1966, P.74

139. Bomzai, P.N.K.: Op.cit., P. 802

140. Fazili, Manzoor,: *Kashmir Government And Politics* Srinagar, Gulshan Publishers, 1982, P.50

141. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: *Jammu and Kashmir* Martinus Nijhoff/The Haque/1960, P.329

142. Interview with Malik Ghulam Rasool, National Conference Legislator from Trehgam on 15.12.1989 at Jammu M.L.A. Hostel.

143. Details about the organisational set up were given by Mohammad Shafi Pir and Mohammad Shafi Khan, the two nominees of Awami Action Committee in the National Conference Legislature Party, in the interviews with the scholar on 7.2.1990 at the M.L.A. Hostel Jammu.

144. Bazaz, P.N.,: *Democracy through Intimidation And Terror* New Delhi, Heritage Publishers, 1978, P.46

145. Ibid.

146. Lamb, Alstair,: *Crisis in Kashmir* London, Routledge and Kegan Pal, 1966, P.118

147. The Kashmir Times(Jammu) September 10, 1989, P.1

148. Interview with Mohammad Shafi Khan, National Conference Legislature (Awami Action Committee nominee) at M.L.A. Hostel, Jammu on 11.12.1989.

149. Ibid.

150. The Kashmir Times, (Jammu) December 3, 1989, P.1

151. Saraf, Mohammad Yusaf,: Op.cit., P.1281

152. Interview with Pir Mohammad Shafi National Conference Legislature (Awami Action Committee) at M.L.A. Hostel, Jammu on 15.12.1989.

153. Interview with Mohammad Shafi Khan, Op.cit.

154. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) October 22, 1989, P.1

155. Ibid

156. Puri, Balraj,: *Jammu -A Clue to Kashmir Tangle* Delhi, Photo Flash Press, 1966. P.14

157. Madhok, Balraj,: *Kashmir: Centre of New Alignments* New Delhi, Deepak Prakashan, 1963, P.37

158. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,; *Jammu and Kashmir* Martinus Nujhoff/The Hague/1960, P.194

159. Moraes, Frank,: *Visit to Kashmir* An article in The Times of India, February 3, 1957, P.6

160. Bomzai, P.N.K.: Op.cit.,P.785

161. Puri, Balraj,: ;Op.cit.,P.33

162. All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, "New Kashmir", New Delhi, Kashmir Bureau of Information, 1944.

163. Bazaz, P.N.,: *Struggle For Freedom in Kashmir* New Delhi, Kashmir Publishing Co., 1954, P.567

164. Puri, Balraj, Op.cit, P.34

165. Madhok, Balraj,: Op.cit., P.38

166. Madhok, Balraj,: *Bungling in Kashmir* Delhi, Hind Pocket Books, 1974, P.38

167. Saraf, Yusaf,: Op.cit., P.1206

168. Verma, Durga Dass,: *Constitution of Jammu & Kashmir Praja Parishad*, Jammu, Iqbal Press, Article 7

169. Ibid., Article 8

170. Ibid. Article 9

171. Ibid. Article 10

172. Ibid. Article 10

173. Ibid. Article 11

174. Ibid., Article 12

175. Ibid., Article 13

176. Ibid., Article 14.

177. Ibid., Article 6

178. An interview with Sham Lal Sharma, one of the founding members of the party at his residence on 22.12.1989.

179. Madhok, Balraj,: *Bungling in Kashmir,* Op.cit., P.38

180. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) November 12, 1951., P.1

181. Interview with Rishi Kumar Kaushal, Vice president State Unit of Bharatiya Janta Party and Ex. Praja Parishad M.L.A., at his residence on 16.12.1989.

182. The Tribune (Ambala) March 22, 1952.

183. Verma, Durga Dass,: Constitution of Praja Parishad, Op.cit., Article 4

184. Madhok, Balraj,: *Bungling in Kashmir,* Op.cit., P.38-39

185. The Times of India (Bombay) September 11, 1951, P.3

186. Singh, Balbir,: Op.cit., P.58

187. Saraf, Yusaf,: Op.cit., P.1206

188. Korbel, Josef,: Op.cit., P.207

189. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) December 18, 1950, P.6

190. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) May 9, 1951, P.1

191. Singh, Balbir,: Op.cit, P.74

192. A plea to understand - A Pamphlet issued by Publicity Secretary All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad, 1952, P.8

193. The Tribune (Ambala) April 2, 1957, P.1

194. Information collected from the election archives.

195. An interview with Prof. Chaman Lal Gupta, General Secretary State Unit of Bharatiya Janta Party and Party M.L.A. at his residence on 8,12.1989.

196. An interview with Rishi Kumar Kaushal, Vice-President State Unit of Bharatiya Janta party and Ex-Legislator at his residence on 16.12.1989.

197. Ibid.

198. An interview with Thakur Baldev Singh, President State Unit of Bharatiya Janta Party at his residence on 25.12.1989.

199. Puri, Geeta, *Bharatiya Jan Sangh*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers 1980, P. 28.

200. Ibid., P.29.

201. Ibid., P.29

202. Ibid., P.30

203. Baxier, Chaig,: *The Jan Sangh* Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1969, P.84

204. Ibid.

205. Puri, Geeta,: Op.cit., P.6

206. Election Archieves, March, 1972, Volume 13(3), P.174

207. Singh, Balbir,: Op.cit.,P.86

208. Narang, A.S.,: *Indian Government And Politics* New Delhi,Geetanjali Publishers, 1987, P.305

209. Agarwal, R.C.: *Indian Government and Politics* New Delhi, S. Chand & Co., 1986, P.474

210. Ibid

211. Interview with Prof. Chaman Lal. Op.cit.

212. 'Bharatiya Janta Party Constitution'. Approved by National Working Committee at Vijyawada on January 2, 1987. (Published by Bharatiya Janta Party, 11 Ashok Road, New Delhi) Art 16, P.9,10

213. Constitution of Bharatiya Janta Party,: Op.cit. Art. 17

214. For details See Article 13, 14 and 15

215. Article 16, Sub Section III.

216. Jonri, J.C.,: *Indian Government and Politics* Delhi, Vishal Publications, 1985, P.969

217. Ibid., P.970

218. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) September 26, 1989, P.7

219. Narang, A.S.,: Op.cit., P.306

220. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) May 7, 1980.

221. Details collected from Election Archives Jammu and Kashmir State.

5

ROLE OF RIGHTIST PARTIES AS OPPOSITION BOTH INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE LEGISLATURE

ROLE OF RIGHTIST PARTIES AS OPPOSITION BOTH INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE LEGISLATURE

No real academic pursuit to analyse or evaluate the dynamics of Kashmir politics of today can be made without taking adequate account of the critical role played by its rightist political parties. Their role inside and outside the state legislature can best be studied in the light of major political issues which were confronted by the people from time to time particularly in post-independence era. Some of these issues not only aroused the keen interest of the cross section of the people inside and outside the state but also created irritations and tensions, conflicts and confrontation and political turmoils in its different regions as well as between the state and the centre. That is why some of the political analysts are of the opinion that the story of constitutional relationship between the state of Jammu and Kashmir and Union of India is still incomplete and is in the process of making.

State Accession

On the national scene, in May 1946, with the failure of the Indian National Congress and the All India Muslim League to reach an agreement on the fundamental issue of unity or division, the British government presented what is known as Cabinet Mission Plan.[1] According to the plan the paramountacy was to lapse and the princes of the State would become free to decide about joining any of the two dominions - India and Pakistan.[2] The Plan was ultimately accepted by the leaders of both, the Congress and the League.[3]

On August 15, 1947 India and Pakistan emerged as two independent dominions. Like some of the other princes, the Maharaja of Kashmir, being carried away by Sentimentalism rather than realism and supported by his advisors and even some of the leaders of the politically conscious groups in the state, also fondled with the idea of independence.[4] Having failed to decide the quantum of accession Maharaja offered a Stand Still Agreement to both the dominions to get more time for the final decision. Pakistan agreed to it hurriedly whereas the government of India wanted concurrence of the people of the state.[5]

Even after the execution of the Stand Still Agreement the relations between Kashmir and Pakistan were far from cordial. The Pakistani

leaders in their efforts to coerce the State to accede to Pakistan imposed economic blockade thereby cutting off the supply of food, petrol and other essential commodities and hindered the free transit of travellers. Military pressure was also applied in the form of hit and run border raids along a 450 miles frontier which rendered the defence of the state ineffective to resist an all out attack.[6]

Meanwhile Mr. Jinah deputed Major Shah, one of the important Secretaries of the Pakistan government to Srinagar to pursue and put pressure on the Maharaja to accede to Pakistan. He had a whip and a sword in one hand and a letter of accession in the other. He met the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, and the top military brass and insisted upon them to advice the Maharaja to accede to Pakistan. When he failed in his efforts he swiftly departed but with the indication that the Maharaja will soon come to grief and realise his folly.[7]

When Mr. Shah submitted his report to the Pakistan government, Mr. Jinah became impatient and in order to force the Maharaja's Muslim majority state to accede to Pakistan, directed the tribesmen to invade Kashmir. The Maharaja of State, therefore, was forced to request for accession of the state to India in order to get military help and save his people from the clutches of invaders. The Indian leadership, on the other hand, insisted that the popular government in Kashmir should be established first and the question of accession to be taken afterwards. Assuming a positive response from the Maharaja of Kashmir in this regard, the government of India accepted the request for the accession of the State to the Indian dominion. The instrument of accession was, therefore, signed on October 27, 1947 and military help was dispatched to kashmir to save its people from the barbaric invasion of tribesmen. The very next day, the Maharaja, while accepting the legitimate demand of his people to establish a responsible government in the state, appointed Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah as the head of the emergency administration.[8]

It was a limited accession principally in respect of three subjects - Defence, External affairs and Communication.[9] The fourth consisted of ancillary matters such as elections to the dominion legislature, offences against law with regard to the aforesaid matters, enquiries and statistics and jurisdiction of the powers of the courts.[10]

The controversy of state's accession seemed to be over by the signing of the instrument of accession between the Maharaja and Governor General of India in October 1947. But it was not the correct

position. The finality of state's accession to India was again challenged in 1952 when the people of Jammu as a whole started a strong movement for the complete merger of the state to India. The Kashmiri nationalists opposed the movement tooth and nail. Due to the internal crisis the first Prime Minister Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah's ministry was dismissed in August 1953 reviving again the doubts about the constitutional relationship with India. Sheikh Abdullah and his close associates who were previously supporting the finality of state's accession to India started raising strong objectives about it.[11]

The issue once again became alive when the report of the Basic Principle committee which recommended that the state would continue to remain acceded to the Indian Union, was presented to the constituent Assembly of the State for consideration on February 3, 1954.[12] Certain members of the assembly were not in favour of accession. However, after heated discussions which continued for three days, the asembly adopted the report and thereby approved state's accession to India.[13]

Inspite of the approval of the constituent Assembly, the doubts about the finality of state's accession to India were raised in the subsequent years also. In order to end this controversy, the Indian Leadership entered into a prolonged dialogue with Sheikh Mohammad abdullah which culminated in Indira-Sheikh Accord of 1975. Sheikh Abdullah and his close associates once again confirmed that state's accession to India was final and irrevocable.

After a lull of few years, the controversy was again raised. During the elections of 8th state legislative assembly in 1987, certain political parties made it an issue to win the sympathy of electorate. The present turmoil in the valley is also due to the fact that there are still certain elements who are not reconciled to the idea of state's accession to India. Stand taken by various rightist parties on the issue, from time to time, requires a thorough analysis.

Praja Parishad, the only important rightist party of Jammu was, from the very beginning in favour of full and final accession of the state to the Indian Union. The stand of the party was made clear by Prem Nath Dogra way back in November 1951. Addressing a convention of party workers he declared that "State's best interests lay in complete and unconditional accession to India.[14] The movement of the party in early 1952 was launched with a view to demand total and unconditional integration of

the state to the Indian Union.[15] The party insisted that issue of accession to India should not be linked with the promise of a plebiscite at a future date.[16] This stand of the party remained consistent in the subsequent years. Bharatiya Jan Sangh and Bharatiya Janta Party which succeeded Praja Parishad also followed the same line of action.

Plebiscite Front which emerged on the political horizon of the state in the wake of arrest of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah in 1953 openly contested State's accession to India. Mirza Afzal Beg, the President of the Plebiscite Front took the stand that issue of accession was still alive and it could only be decided by the people of Jammu and Kashmir through the exercise of right of self-determination in a plebiscite.[17] The white paper issued by the party after a meeting of its delegates on June 27 and 28, 1964 was an open book on the attitude of the party vis-a-vis the constitutional position of the state.[18] The white Paper stated that the fate of the state was attached to the fulfilment of the promise of plebiscite. The Front stood steadyfast to this objective upto 1975. The demand for a plebiscite was dropped in the wake of Indira-Sheikh Accord.

Jamaat-e-Islami stands for the Islamization of the state of Jammu & Kashmir. It believes that accession of the state to India is temporary and, as such, subject to the ratification by the people.[19] This condition has, the Jamaat holds, been recognised by the United Nations also. On this basis the Jamaat-e-Islami maintains that the people of Kashmir still retain the right to self-determination. The leaders of the party are opposed to the word 'Secular' which smacks of a tilt in favour of India.[20] Syed Ali Shah Geelani, the supremo of Jamaat, believes that Kashmir was still a disputed territory and its accession with India was not final. The only solution to this issue was holding of a plebiscite to allow the people to take a decision about their future.[21] He is further of the opinion that New Delhi is yet to honour Nehru's assurance on holding a plebiscite in the State to determine whether the Kashmiris want to accede to India or to Pakistan.[22]

Awami Action Committee has been a genuine pro-Pakistan party at work on he political landscape of Kashmir. Its President Maulvi Farooq has on many occasions disputed the accession of Kashmir to India. He blames Sheikh Abdullah for linking the fate of Kashmir with India for his own petty personal interest.[23] He also blames the government of India for denying to the people of the State their basic rights.[24] Moreover, the

constitution of the Awami Action Committee is based on the right of the Kashmiri people to determine their own future.[25]

In order to find out the view points of various Rightist Parties on the issue of accession the researcher interviewed top leaders of the parties and some of their active members. Their view points have been reflected in the following table:-

TABLE NO. 17

Parties to which the respondents belonged	The accession of the State with the Indian Union in full, final and irrevocable	The accession of the State to India is subject to final approval of its people through Plebiscite	The respondents who avoided to answer the question	% age
1.a) Praja Parishad b) Jan Sangh c) B.J.P.	15	x	x	21.43
2. Plebiscite Front	x	20	x	28.58
3. Jamaat-e-Islami	x	15	x	21.43
4. Awami Action Committee	x	10	x	14.28
5. Others	x	x	10	14.28
		70		100

From the legal point of view the instrument of accession signed by Maharaja with the Governor General of India way back in 1947 was legal, constitutional and final. Moreover, the Constituent Assembly as the true representative body of the people of the State had also confirmed its finality. The basic issue is that when a certain group of Kashmiri leaders are in power, they support state's accession with the Union of India. But when they are out of power, they challenge its finality to get cheap popularity and support from the fundamentalist and secessionist elements particularly in the valley.

Article 370

The process of integration and constitutional adjustments which had been adopted in regard to other Indian States was not at all followed in case of Jammu and Kashmir State. The constitutional relationship between the state and the centre continued to be governed by the provisions of the Instrument of Kashmir Accession signed on October 27, 1947.

When the constitution of India was in the final stages of making, it was deemed necessary to make provisions in it regarding the status of Kashmir State. Certain broad principles were, therefore, agreed upon by the centre and the state leadership in a meeting held in Delhi in May 1949. The position crystalized finally when article 306 A[26] was drafted to be placed before consembly of India. This draft was revised three times just to accommodate the view points of both the parties.[27]

The provisions for giving a special status to Kashmir state were, thus, finally embodied in the Article 370 of the Indian constitution.[28] It was a step to fulfill the long cherised desire of the Kashmiri leaders with regard to state autonomy. The object behind enacting this article, in other words, was to recognise the special position of the state of Jammu and Kashmir by limiting the powers of the Union President and the Parliament.[29]

An analysis of the provisions of Article 370 clearly show that the competence of the Indian Parliament was restricted to:-

a) Such articles in the Union and concurrent list of 7th Schedule to the Indian Constitution as correspond to the subjects specified in the Instrument of Accession;

b) Eleboration of which (subjects) was to be done by the President by an order, in consultation with the State Government; and

c) Addition to which were to be made with the concurrence of the state government.[30]

The position which emerged by the incorporation of Article 370 was that only Articles 1 and 370 of the Indian Constitution were to apply to the State of Jammu and Kashmir in their original form.[31] Moreover, the further progress about the constitutional relationship between the state and the centre was contigent on the recommendations of the Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly. In other words the residuary powers

were reserved for the state, and the state constituent Assembly was made the sole and the decisive factor in this regard. Both the President and the Parliament enjoyed merely a formal authority.[32] The explanation clause of Article 370 pointed out that the Government of the State would mean the person then being recognised by the President as the Maharaja of Kashmir acting on the advice of Council of Minister being in office under Maharaja's proclamation dated May 5, 1948.

The controversy of special status granted to the Jammu and Kashmir state as envisaged in article 370 of the Indian Constitution has been subjected to heated debates and discussions since its incorporation in the constitution and the subsequent application to the state. Different view points have been expressed by the corss section of people as well as political parties inside and outside the legislature.

The rightist parties of Jammu strongly objected to the incorporation of Article 370 in the constitution of India and its subsequent application to the state of Jammu and Kashmir. They took the stand that the state should be fully brought under the preview of the Indian constitution by repealing the controversial Article. This would not only create a sense of security among the faithful elements of the state but would also demoralise the unpatriotic and secessionist groups in the valley.[33]

The Praja Parishad, from the very beginning opposed the idea of granting special treatment to the state in accordance with Article 370. It took the stand that this Article should be deleted as soon as possible.[34] The party not only presumed the finality of the accession but also demanded an end to the privileged treatment of the state as provided by the Indian constitution. It was clear to party President P.N. Dogra and his colleagues that accession would mean little or nothing to the Hindus of Jammu province as long as the state retained a special status under Article 370. For, it would merely confirm their continued domination by Abdullah and the Muslim leadership from Kashmir. Thus, in an attempt to safe-guard the future of their community, the Praja Parishad leaders called for the abrogation of Article 370 and the complete integration of Jammu and Kashmir State with the Indian Union.[35] The Jan Sangh and Bharatiya Janta Party have always regarded Article 370 as a great hinderance in the final integration of the state with the Indian Union. Election manifesto released by Bharatiya Janta Party on the eve of Lok Sabha elections of 1989 reflects party's strong objections against this Article.[36] While speaking in the debate over the crisis in Kashmir, the

Bharatiya Janta Party members attributed the current turmoil in the valley to the failure of successive Indian governments to do away with the controversial Article.[37]

"Had this article not been there the secessionist forces in the valley would not have raised their heads".[38]

For Plebiscite Front Article 370 of the Indian Constitution was irrelevant because it refused to recognise Kashmir accession to India. The Front leaders helped on the right of self-determination and held the view that their acceptance of Article 370 would have meant giving legitimacy to the Indian democratic institutions.[39]

Jamaat-e-Islami regards the state of Jammu and Kashmir a disputed territory and says that its future can only be decided by the people by the exercise of right of self-determination. The Jamaat leaders believes that the Government of India should grant this right to the people of the state. It also holds the opinion that the Indian government has no locus stand in Kashmir and any provision of the Indian constitution has no meaning for the people of Kashmir.[40] It was on this ground that Jamaat-e-Islami refused to take oath of allegiance to the Indian constitution and boycotted the elections to Lok Sabha in November, 1989.

Awami Action Committee has taken the stand that accession of Kashmir with Indian Union was closely linked with Article 370 of the constitution and in case any attempt was made to abrogate the latter, the relationship between India and Kashmir would automatically came to end.[41] Mirwaiz Maulvi Farooq, the Chairman of the Awami Action committee has criticised Bharatiya Janta Party for demanding the scraping of the Article 370. [42]

Convening of Constituent Assembly

The idea of having a constitution making body for the state of Jammu and Kashmir was first mooted by a few Kashmiri political elites[43] in their representation given to Lord Reading who visited the valley in 1924.[44] This demand was also revived in several memorials submitted to the Maharaja by different communities to highlight their grievances after the disturbances of 1931.[45]

The same demand was once again made by All Jammu and Kashmir National conference at its historic Sopore session of 1944. It was incorporated in Naya Kashmir Manifesto adopted in that session.[46]

Inspite of the repeated demands of the cross section of the people of kashmir and various political parties to convene the constitution assembly of the State to draft its democratic constitution with Maharaja as the constitutional head, nothing substantial came out under the autocratic rule of the Dogra dynasty.

The General Council of All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference as early as 1948 again urged the State Government to convene a constituent assembly to shape the destiny of the state and to implement the cherished objective of Naya Kashmir. As a result, the Maharaja of the State issued a proclamation on March 5, 1948 mentioning in addition to the replacement of Emergency Government with popular interim government headed by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, to convene a constituent assembly based on adult suffrage and proportionally representing all the sections of the population and the areas of the State as soon as normal conditions were restored.[47]

Moreover, the need of the constituent Assembly to draft a separate constitution for the people of Jammu and Kashmir state had been the settled policy of the Government of India. The right of the Kashmir State to draft its constitution was also recognised by Sardar Patel.[48] Sir Gopala Swamy Ayyangar, while moving article 306A (which later on became Article 370 of the constitution) and mentioning the reasons for giving special treatment to the Kashmir State, in reply to the question of Maulana Hasrat Mohani in the Indian Constituent - Assembly on October 17, 1949 also pointed out that the will of the people of Kashmir through the medium of Constituent Assembly would determine the constitution of the State and the Union jurisdiction over it.[49]

Meanwhile Article 370 of the Indian Constitution which was enforced on January 26, 1950 recognised the right of the people of the state to convene a Constituent Assembly of their own to draft the constitution of the state.[50] To deliberate upon the issue, the All Jammu and Kashmir National conference met in a session on October 27, 1950 at Srinagar.[51] In order to end the state of uncertainty, the General Council of the party issued a mandate to the Supreme National executive for the convening of constituent Assembly based upon adult suffrage and embracing all sections of the people and all the constituents of the state for the purpose of determining the future shape and affiliation of the state of Jammu and Kashmir.[52] As a result Yuvraj Karan Singh, the Regent of the state and

the son of Maharaja Hari Singh issued a proclamation for the convening of the Constituent Assembly on April 30, 1951.[53]

The Rightist Parties of the state reacted violently to the proposal to set up a separate Constituent Assembly for Kashmir. The All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parishad and the All Jammu and Kashmir Sahayak Sabha opposed the move and took the stand that when all the political parties had given a unanimous verdict for the accession to India, there was no need for setting up a Constituent assembly for the state. They favoured the full integration of the state with India and the application of Indian constitution to Kashmir in its entirely.[54] As the spokesman of the interests of the Jammu Hindus, Praja Parishad tried its best to off set the impact of the assembly's first session.[55] Prem Nath Dogra, the Party President made it clear that there was no need for separate state constitution, as there could be no better constitution than that of India.[56] He believed that the union charter should be made applicable to the Jammu and Kashmir State also.[57]

The rightist parties of the valley also criticised the setting up of the state constituent Assembly but on some other grounds. They described this move to deprive the people of Kashmir of their right of self-determination.[58] They questioned the validity of the convening of constituent Assembly, when 'half of the state', being out of India's control, and thus not having any representation in the Constituent Assembly. They, thus regarded such a move as an endorsement of the forcible, illegal and immoral occupation of Kashmir on the part of India by means of "deliberate fraud"[59]

Till today there has been no change in the attitude of the existing rightist parties in the valley. Though much water has flown in the river Jehlum since then, yet they have not reconciled with the changed circumstances and still question, not only the legality of state's accession to India but also the competence of consembly to frame the state constitution without the exercise of right of self-determination by Kashmiris.[60]

Land Reforms

The land system in the state of Jammu and Kashmir owed its genesis to be practices inherited from the successive alien regimes which ruled it for centuries by conquest, through the use of brutal force or by deceit or reward for retaining potentate over the state. In order to establish

themselves in the foreign land, the victor monarches created a class of fuedal landlords who helped them in exploiting and subjugating the masses. They were really no landlords of the type dealing with the cultivation of the land but a class of exploiters who, due to a weak government had in a bid for power amongst the successive rulers of the time, built their own strongholds and living on the labours of the poor tillers, got themselves installed as landed aristocrarcy.[61]

The feudal lords not only acted as the agents of the rulers but also their collectors. The cultivators suffered impoverishment and were reduced to abject penury. In short, the agrarian system before the introduction of Lawerence's land settlement of 1889 was feudal in character and exploitative in nature.[62]

In order to give the cultivators an equal and rightful place in the social order to stop his exploitation, the All Jammu and Kashmir National conference thought necessary to bring the tillers of the soil in direct relationship of the state, abolish the intermediatory interest in the land and remove the disparities in the quantum of land owned by the individuals. The party, therefore, made a frontal attack on the state's feudal land system which had sucked the blood of cultivators and deprived them of their personality and reduced them to abject destitution. The party in its famous 'Naya Kashmir' pleaded for the abolition of landlordism and advocated the principle of land to the tillers.[63]

When the popular government headed by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah came in to power, it started taking steps to fulfill its promised pledges to make the peasantary free from the shackles of slavery and sufferings. As a first step towards this direction, the government enacted a legislation in March 1948 to remove the burden of parasitic heirarchy of jagirdars, Muafidars and Mukararies.[64] As a result of this enactment 396 jagirs and Muafidars and 2347 Mukararies disappeared from the state.[65]

The popular government then appointed a 'Land to the Tiller' Committee in 1949[66] to look in to the problems of peasantry. In order to further alleviate the distress of the poverty stricken people of the state, the government considered thoroughly the problem of rural industries. In February 1950, the government issued an ordinance delaying for six months the realization of all debts. Simultaneously, the state government passed 'Distressed Debter Relief Act' which relieved the peasants from the burden of their accumulated debts. On July 13, 1950, the 19th

anniversary of Martyr's Day, the government took a historic decision on transferring land to the tillers. As a result the Big Landed Estate Abolition Act was enacted on October 17, 1950.[67] Under the provisions of this Act the landlords were allowed to retain only 182 kanal of land besides the orchids, grasslands and fuel services.[68] The right of ownership of land in excess of this limit was taken away and transferred to the tillers. On the most important question of compensation to the landlords, the Act provided that the constituent Assembly of the state would resolve it. The constituent Assembly, however, unanimously decided that land would be taken away without payment of any compensation.[69]

Although the Big Landed Estate Abolition act of 1950 benefitted a large number of tillers of the soil, yet a number of anomalies, lacunas, in equalities and inconsistencies were also created. All these anomalies created dissatisfaction among those land-lords whose holdings exceeded the ceiling limits. The expropriated landlords, thus raised hue and cry against the implementation of this Act.

In order to pacify them, the government appointed the Wazir Committee in 1953[70] headed by Janki Nath Wazir, the Chief Justice of the State High court. The Committee after an enquiry made a number of recommendations to overcome the inconsistencies in the legislation but no action was taken by the government in this direction.

In March 1963, the government constituted a Land Commission under the Chairmanship of Syed Mir Qasim, the revenue minister of the state. One of the terms of reference of this commission was to examine the gapes in the existing land laws. The Commission submitted its report in 1968. One of the most important recommendations of this commission was that system of landlord - Tenant relationship in the state's agrarian economy should be replaced by the institution of peasant proprietorship of land.[71] The government after considering the report enacted another legislation known as Agrarian Reforms Act of 1972. The Act prescribed the ceiling of land at 12.5 standard acres.

In 1975, when Sheikh Adullah again came to power, the government suspended the operation of Agrarian Reforms Act. A seven member Committee was then appointed to recast and reshape the act. The Committee drafted a bill which was finally enacted as the Jammu and Kashmir Agrarian Act of 1976. However, the Act could not be implemented due to some technical difficulties.[72]

When the National Conference government headed by Sheikh MohammadAdullah again returned to power in 1977, it once again picked up the threads and proposed some amendments to the Act. Finally the Jammu and Kashmir Agrarian Reforms (Amendment) act was passed and came into force on July 13, 1978. One of the striking provisions of the Act was that the landlordism was completely abolished and land was given to the tillers who actually cultivated it. The act also did not provide for reasonable amount of compensation to those who had to part with their lands.

Land reforms programme of National Conference government succeeded in alienating an increasing large number of Hindus in the state, particularly in the Jammu province.[73] Many unhappy land lords turned to Praja Parshid, the party which was Critial of Sheikh Abdullah's revolutionary land policy.[74] As the main rightist party it objected to the haphazard manner in which the land reforms programme was taken up. The party took the stand that land reforms resulted in the fragmentation of land holdings without doing any real good to the tillers.[75] It was also alleged by the party that reforms were an attempt to benefit Muslims at the cost of Hindus.[76] Speaking to gathering of party workers in November 1964 Prem Nath Dogra took Sheikh Abdullah to task on the land reforms issue. He pointed out that his party had no objection to the idea of land to the tiller but insisted that landlords should be properly compensated in line with the provisions of the India Constitution.[77] As the spokesmen of Rajputs who constituted the most hard hit class among the landlords, the Khshatriya Prantik Sabha and Shri Amar Khshatriya Prantik Sabha also reacted violently to the manner in which their rights were snatched in the name of land reforms. There was jubilation in the Kashmir valley over the land reforms initiated by the National Conference government. All the rightist parties across the Pirpanchal termed it as a revolutionary economic step. The Plebiscite Front which was once a part of National Conference supported the land reforms of the government because they formed part of the "Naya Kashmir' programme to the drafting of which its leaders had played a significant role.[78] In fact improvement in the condition of peasantry become an important part of its policy and programme.

The Jamaat-e-Islami which became active in the political field in the Seventies also favoured land reforms and pledged to work for improvement in the existing land rules.[79] Other small groups in the valley having

right leanings also appreciated various steps taken by the government to improve the lot of peasant who had for centuries suffered at the hands of feudal lords.

Abolition of Monarchy and Elected Head of the State

The British, true to their policy of expansionism, achieved their objectives through a network of alliances with the Indian princes. These mutually helpful alliances enabled the British not only to consolidate their power in India but also helped the native princes to tighten their grip over their subjects. In recognition to their services to the British crown, the Indian princes earned the reward of limited sovereignity over their states under the protection and suzerainty of the paramount power.[80]

The state of Jammu and Kashmir came to be transferred to Maharaja Gulab Singh after the Sikh empire began to disintegrate. His failure to render competent assistance to sikh armies during sikh wars was duly noticed by the British.[81] This paved the way for the total occupation of northern India by the British who were not slow in recognising Maharaja Gulab Singh's services to them. In reward, they sold him the territory of Kashmir for 75 lakhs of rupees under the treaty of Amritsar. In accordance with this treaty, the British government transferred all the hilly and mountainous country situated to eastward of river Indus and westward of river Ravi.[82] In this way, the entire population of the state came under the absolute authority of the Dogra dynasty. While in British India, and even in some Indian states many reforms were introduced to alleviate the miseries of the people, the unenlightened absolutism of some of the Dogra rulers drove the Kashmiri people deeper and deeper in poverty and degradation. When the conditions became increasingly intolerable, the people of the state made determined efforts to wrest the power from the hands of the ruler. In the historic Sopore session of 1944, the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference adopted the 'Naya Kashmir' manifesto which retained the ruler of the state as constitutional head with limited powers. The Quit Kashmir Movement of 1946 was one of the steps to achieve this objective.[83]

By 1947, India had achieved independence, it was clear that with the withdrawal of paramount power, the treaty rights of the Indian princes would cease. The sovereignty in that case was to revert back to the people. But a strange situation arose. The All Jammu and Kashmir National conference had made it clear as early as February 10, 1946 that it was not in favour of any further continuation of the treaty rights of the

princes. In the memorandum submitted to the Cabinet Mission, the party demanded independence from autocracy. In the post-independence period, no doubt Maharaja first appointed the popular leaders as the head of emergency administration and then the Prime Minister of the state, yet differences emerged between the Maharaja and Sheikh Abdullah. In his attempt to take away all powers from Maharaja and to reduce him to only a figurehead Sheikh Abdullah was supported by Congress leadership, particularly Pandit Nehru.

One of the most important tasks of the consembly of Kashmir, which was constituted way back in 1951, was to decide the future of the ruling dynasty. The consembly, however, referred the matter to be discussed and debated by the Basic Principles Committee in 1952.[84] The Committee in its interim report submitted to the consembly on June 10, 1952[85] proposed that :-

a) The form of the future constitution of Jammu and Kashmir should be wholly democratic

b) the institution of heredity should be terminated; and

c) the office of the head of the state should be elective.

The report was unanimously approved by Kashmir consembly on June 2, 1952.[86]

Consequent upon the decision taken by the Basic Principles Committee monarchy was abolished. The post of the head of the state which fell vacant was filled on November 14, 1952 when Yuvraj Karan Singh became the first democratically elected head of the state.[87]

The abolition of Monarchy was not liked by the people of Jammu. The Praja Parishad as the principal rightist party of Jammu bitterly criticised Sheikh Abdullah for the treatment meted out to Maharaja Hari Singh. Prem Nath Dogra, the party president disputed the contention of Sheikh Abdullah that Hari Singh had lost the confidence of all the people in the state. Except for National Conference, Dogra claimed, everybody had full confidence in the Maharaja. The treatment meted out to His Highness was based on the spirit of revenge, the Praja Parishad leader claimed.[88] Abolition of Monarchy also invited angry protests from Khshatriya Prantik Sabha and other rightist groups from Jammu province.[89]

The rightist parties of Jammu were also against the appointment of Yuvraj Karan Singh as the Sadar-e-Riyast. Many prominent Hindus of

Jammu tried to pursued the young prince to reject the offer of becoming a powerless Head of the State. It was pointed out that he would be a pawn in the hands of Sheikh Abdullah and his colleagues.[90]

Karan Singh invited the wrath of Jammu people by accepting the office of the Head of the State. Some idea of the extent of opposition in Jammu province revealed when the new head of the State made the seasonal move from Srinagar to city of Jammu, the winter capital. The arrival of Yuvraj Karan Singh on November 24, 1952 was met by the Hindu demonstrators waving black flags and shouting slogans.[91]

The rightist parties in the valley, on the other hand, welcomed the end of Monarchy in the state. They took the stand that the institution of Monarchy was the relic of the feudal system which was based on exploitation and was, therefore, against the aspiration of the people. They strongly felt that the continuance of a monarchical system would mean the imposition of a anachronism particularly when monarchies were disappearing fast everywhere in the world under the compelling forces of history and social change. The rightist parties of the valley further took the stand that the office of the head of the State should be based upon the elective principle and not upon the principle of heredity. The heredity principle in the appointment to any office of power would curtail the people's choice and to that extent, restrict the right to elect suitable person of outstanding merit.[92]

The rightist parties of the valley also opposed the election of Karan Singh, as the Sadar-e-Riyast. For them, the son of the last Maharaja was the most hated person in the State. His election as the head of the state, which meant practically full control of authority in the state, was unacceptable because his occupation of the august office would always remind the Kashmiris of the havoc played by Dogra rulers during the freedom struggle in Kashmir.[93]

Separate Flag and Emblem for the State

The national movement in the state had, from the very beginning, a distinctive growth and character. Gradually it widened the sphere of its contacts and was actively associated, in particular, with the Indian National Congress. But it did not have a formal affiliation with any other organisation. When the question of the adoption of the party flag for the National Conference came up in 1938, all possible choices were fully considered.[94] It was likely that the tricolour flag might have been

adopted by the party. But the Indian National Congress at its Tripura Session had decided that no political organisation in any Indian state should adopt its flag.[95]

The National Conference, therefore, adopted a red flag with white emblem of 'plough' in its centre, as a symbol of its political organisation in 1939.[96] The red back ground was adopted to signify the ascendency of the toilers and tillers to a place of dignity and honour and plough to bring out the supreme need for the promotion of the interests of the vast masses of cultivators who had suffered under feudal suppression for centuries. It, thus, evolved a flag which embodied its basic programme dedicated to the uplift of down trodden section of the state population, the peasants and the working people, both manual and intellectual. The struggle for freedom in Kashmir from 1939 till the establishment of a popular government in the state was carried on under the National Conference flag described above.

The controversy of flag again emerged in 1952 when the students of G.G.M. Science College, Jammu staged a demonstration and registered a protest against the National Conference flag. The incident led to penalisation of the students. The effected students went on hunger strike which evoked protests from all sections of the people resulting in violence and lathi charge by the police followed by the imposition of curfew.[97] The government blamed the Praja Parshid for inspiring and organising the whole show.[98]

On the other hand, the Basic Principles Committee submitted a resolution pointing out that: "The Flag of Jammu and Kashmir state should be rectangular in shape and red in colour with three vertical strips of equal width next to the white plough in the middle with its handles facing the strips.[99] The resolution received overwhelming support from the members in both the houses of the State Legislature and was passed unanimously with minor amendments. Sheikh Abdullah stressed that the state's Flag was in no sense a rival of the National Flag and it was only due to the historic and other reasons connected with the freedom struggle that its necessity was felt.

Similarly the Emblem Committee presented its report to the Kashmir consembly on November 12, 1952 which was adopted unanimously.[100] Briefly tracing the history of different emblems adopted by the state from time to time. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, the leader of the house said that the Emblem of the state should be sheild like figure

with three equidistant horizontal strips and a lotus in full bloom on its top with two ploughs facing each other around its edges, the whole surrounded by two ears of corn with the inscription, "Jammu and Kashmir" at its bottom.[101] While highlighting the salient features he pointed out that two ploughs on two corners facing each other rendered peasantry conspicuous as it constituted 95% of the state population. The two ears of corn denoted the agrarian economy of the state. The three horizontal strips represented the Illaqas of Jammu, the Kashmir valley (which was called the lotus home) and Ladakh. To denote all these things the lotus was shown raised from the level of water in the Emblem.[102] Major Prar Singh, Ghulam Mohammad Talib, S. Harbans Singh Azad, S. Kulbir Singh, Kh. Ghulam Ahmed Dev and Ram Piara Saraf while highlighting its features supported the motion.[103] They pointed out that the Emblem depicted the economic conditions and culture of the state;[104] it reflected the past and present civilizations of the state, and it denoted the desires and aspirations of the class in power. The motion was then put to vote and adopted.[105]

The rightist parties and groups in Jammu criticised the adoption of separate flag and Emblem for the state different then that of the Indian union. They were of the view that it would generate further a sense of separatism among the people of the state which would ultimately weaken the unity of the country and lead to disintegration. While addressing a convention of party workers in Jammu Prem Nath Dogra openly advocated that Maharaja's flag was in fact the flag of the Dogras.[106] He pointed out that the people of Jammu considered the new state flag as an anti-Dogra flag under which they had been and were being vilified and could not tolerate it, particularly as a rival of National flag. He further added that if National conference had its sentiments for its party flag, the Dogras also had their sentiments for the flag under which they had fought to build the state during the last one hundred years.[107]

He also pleaded for the retention of the old Dogra Emblem for the state. Other rightist groups in Jammu region also took the stand that separate flag and emblem for the state would ultimately endanger India's unity and spirit of oneness. They argued that if a flag and emblem symbolized a nation, how could then one Nation have two flags and two Emblems. All this was nothing but an attempt to support the two nation's theory.[108]

The rightist parties in the valley, on the other hand, welcomed the

adoption of the separate flag and separate Emblem for the state. They were of the view that adoption of separate flag and separate Emblem by the consembly further confirmed the special status of the state and, symbolised the success of its struggle against the century old Dogra autocratic rule.

Delhi Agreement of 1952

The objections of the Dogra nationalists to the limited accession of the state with the Union of India, the incorporation of Article 370 in the constitution of India and the convening of the Kashmir's consembly the land reforms of 1950s with all their omissions and commissions, the refusal of payment of compensation to the expropriated landlords, the abolition of Dogra Dynastic Monarchy, the neglect of Ladakh region, the anti-Dogra attitude and Chauvnistic tendencies of the Kashmiri leadership and the anti-Kashmiri feelings in the Jammu region had created large scale discontentment in various parts of the state. In otherwords, valley's wails, ladakh's laments and Jammu's remonstances provided an opportunity to the reactionary elements both inside and outside the state to exploit the situation with a view to precipitating a crisis which might result in internal instability and confusion. In an atmosphere of uncertainity Mirza Afzal Beg, the Chairman, Basic Principles Committee, pointed out in the consembly on March 24, 1952, that the state of Jammu and Kashmir would be an autonomous Republic within the Indian Union with a Separate President, National Assembly, judiciary, Regional autonomy and separate citizenship.[109]

In a memorandum submitted to the state Prime Minister, Kashap Bakula, the Head lama of Ladakh and member of consembly demanded a Statutory provision in the future constitution of the state under which state's North-Eastern Frontier province of Ladakh covering sinkiang and Western Tibet would be federating unit of Kashmir as long as accession of the state with India endured. He further urged that a separate Legislative Assembly of 15 members with an executive council responsible to it should be set up for Ladakh to run the internal administration of the area and no measure effecting the economic political and religious life of the province be passed by the state consembly or government without its approval.[110]

Mr. Ayyanger, the then minister of state of India, visited Jammu in April, 1952 to study the situation and to cool the passions.[111] Kashap Bakula met him and repeated his demands. Dogri Sanstha, a cultural

organisation of Dogra Pahari people of Jammu also submitted a resolution to him criticising the above said pronouncement of Mirza Afzal Beg in the Kashmir consembly. Mr. Ayyanger advised the farmers of the state constitution to be practical and not be led by shibboleth of theocratic ideas and rather display a measure of political wisdom.[112] At his instance, the Praja Parshid leaders, who had been earlier on arrested because of their agitational approach, were released by the State administration. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah felt hurt by central intervention which created bitterness in him against such uncalled for interference from Delhi.[113]

Moreover, the subsequent activities on utterances of some of the top National Conference leaders further deepened the crisis. For example, in a sensational speech at R.S. Pura in April 1952 Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah said that Kashmir could not fully accede to India until communalism was completely eliminated from the country.[114] He further pointed out that Kashmir's accession to India would be of a restrictive nature and those who wanted it to lose its separate identity were talking without any conception of political realities that face them.[115]

In another speech on April 18, 1952 at Hazaratbal, Sheikh Abdullah pointed out that in no way Kashmiris were prepared to renounce their cherished ideology in furtherence of which they had offered blood and sweat during the last two decades. He added that Kashmiris had acceded to India in respect of three subjects - Defence, external Affairs and communication and they enjoyed complete freedom in their internal affairs. These speeches caused an uproar in different parts of the state and the Indian press and public opinion became much agitated.

As a result, a deputation of Kashmiri leaders was summoned to Delhi on June 12, 1952. The deputation arrived in the central capital on July 1, 1952[116] and held a series of discussions with the central government in order to resolve the constitutional deadlock. Sheikh Abdullah who had previously refused to visit Delhi to talk to the Indian leaders, finally joined the deputation on July 17, 1952.[117] He had a series of meetings with Pt. Nehru from July 18 to July 22, 1952 and an agreement was finally signed by both the leaders on July 23, 1952.[118] The agreement popularly known as Delhi Agreement was a step forward in giving the state of Jammu and Kashmir a special status in the Union of India. In a statement made on July 25, 1952 in Lok Sabha, the Indian Prime Minister gave the details of the terms of Agreement. The subjects covered in the Agreement were: [119]

1. **Residuary Powers**

   Residuary powers would vest in the state in the case of Kashmir, although in regard to all other states it would vest in the Union. More powers could be transferred to the Union by the people of Kashmir.

2. **Citizenship**

   The residents of the state would be the citizens of India. "It was further agreed that the state legislature shall have the power to define and regulate the rights and privileges of the permanent resident of the State, more especially in regard to acquisition of immovable property, appointment to services and like matters".

3. **Fundamental Rights:**

   The decisions regarding land compensation would be protected and whether a chapter on separate Fundamental Rights be included in the Kashmir Constitution would be decided.

4. **Supreme Court :**

   The Supreme Court's jurisdiction was recognised in regard to such Fundamental Rights as would be agreed to by the state, as also regarding disputes mentioned in article 131 of the Indian Constitution. It would be the final court of appeal. But detailed examination of this would be necessary and "it was agreed that we should have time to consider it further."

5. **State Flag:**

   The new state Flag was no rival to the National Flag, but its continuance was necessary for historical and other reasons. The Union Flag would occupy the supremely distinctive place in the State.

6. **President of India:**

   Powers to grant reprieve and commute death sentences would belong to President of the Union.

7. **Headship of State:**

   Following principles were agreed upon: (a) the head of the state shall be the person recognised by the President of Union on the recommendation of the legislature of the state; (b) he shall hold office during the pleasure of the President; (c) he may, by writing under his

hand addressed to the President, resign his office; (d) he shall hold office for five years; and (e) he shall continue to hold office till his successor was elected.

8. **Financial Integration:**

The necessity of some financial arrangement was seen, but a detailed and objective examination was considered necessary.

9. **Emergency Powers:**

On the application of Article 352 of the Indian Constitution opinions differed, but it was ultimately agreed upon that Central intervention in regard to internal disturbances could come only at the request or with the concurrence of the government of the state. The Government of India did not press for the application of Article 356 or Article 360. Other Articles were acceptable to Kashmir, but the delegation of the state wanted some time to study the implications.[120]

On august 14, 1952, Sheikh Abdullah wanted the Assembly "to consider the agreement. During the debate, emphasis in the speeches varied, although no dissident opinions were expressed. One member, Mubarak Shah, said that, "his faith in India had been strengthened after the agreement." Mir Qasim maintained that "we have acceded to India with a definite purpose, unless this purpose is achieved, we will stick to it". All members generally emphasized the need for autonomy and the amendments moved were an indication of the trend of opinion.[121] one amendment moved by Abdul Gani Goni wanted the head of the state to hold office, "as long as he commands the confidence of the legislature" and not of the Indian President. Another amendment moved by Ghulam Rasul wanted Article 352 to be used at the request of the Jammu and Kashmir state" and not of the Government of the State. Assad Ullah Mir wanted a separate set of Fundamental Rights for the State. Although the amendments were not accepted, the predominant urge for a degree of special autonomy for Kashmir could be seen. In this urge, the components were not always similar. While one section feared that full-fledged integration with India would throw the State open to 'outsiders', other believed that a separate status would help re-model Kashmir's socio-economic structure on socialistic lines without any constitutional hurdles in the way. One common argument was that the National Conference was committed to this in the "New Kashmir Programme of 1944".[122]

The rightist parties both in the state and in the rest of the country

reacted unfavourably to the Delhi agreement. A huge demonstration was held outside the parliament to protest against what was termed as an unholly agreement.[123] Inside the parliament, N.C. Chatterjee ridiculed the idea of a Republic within a Republic. In his speech, Dr. Shayama Parshad Mukherjee severely criticised Sheikh Abdullah and cast serious doubts about his impartiality, dubbing his secularism as a fraud.[124]

The All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parshid described Nehru - Abdullah Agreement as a great victory for fascist and disruptive forces functioning in the state, those who cherished any faith in the freedom of motherland would condemn the agreement and disown it.[125] The party's rank and file rejected the agreement and called it another surrender at the altar of communal intransigence and separatism of Sheikh Abdullah, a fraud on the Indian people and an attack on the Indian Constitution.[126]

The rightist parties of Kashmir valley on the other hand, welcomed the Delhi Agreement and described at a step towards the further confirmation of maximum state autonomy. The Plebiscite Front leadership headed by Mirza Afzal Beg had been a party to the Delhi Agreement and thus did not criticise it in subsequent years, though it never reconciled itself to the idea of state's accession to India.[127] Jamaat-e-Islami[128] and Awami Action Committee[129] which mushroomed in the years following 1952 were also not against the Delhi Agreement.

Crisis of August 1953

Delhi Agreement of 1952 and the reaction generated by it in different regions of the state in the subsequent months further complicated the political scenario of Jammu and Kashmir state. The Praja Parshid leadership declared that the party would launch a Satyagrah if the agreement was enforced.[130]

The inhabitants of Doda district[131] too, being much agitated emphasised that as they had peculiar local problems and that they were historically, geographically and culturally quite different from their neighbouring regions, they could not in any way be attached with the cultural unit of Jammu.[132] They stressed that they should be given a status of separate cultural unit by dividing the state in to five cultural units - Kashmir, Jammu, Poonch - Rajouri, Ladakh and Doda[133] in the future set up of the state.

On the other hand, the valley too was not calm. An opposition group, Awami Conference under the leadership of Kh. Umar Bhat[134] was

allowed to come in to existence within the ranks of National Conference. Pro-Pakistan elements were also encouraged by the hostile attitude of Jammu people and they demanded secession.[135] The Nationalist Group demanded maximum autonomy for the state. Regional sentiments helped to fragment popular discontent and regional tension brought regional cordiality to an end.

The state government lost no time in implementing those provisions of Delhi Agreement which aimed at autonomy. Monarchy was abolished and Yuvraj Karan Singh was elected as Sadar-i-Riyast.[136] These steps provoked the people of Jammu who accused Sheikh Abdullah for his attempts to ignore those parts of the agreement which confirmed Kashmir's ties with India.[137] There were also rumours that there were growing differences in the cabinet and the working Committee of the National conference in regard to the interpretation and implementation of Delhi Agreement.[138]

Pt. Prem Nath Dogra and Mr. S.P. Mukherjee met at Jullunder on November 8, 1952 and discussed the plans for a Satyagrah as Praja Parshid's eight point programme was not accepted by the state government. With the arrest of Pt. P.N. Dogra and Sham Lal Sharma on November 21, 1952 the agitation started.[139] This movement assumed serious proportions and its repercussions were left outside the state also. Anti-Kashmir feelings in Jammu developed anti-Muslim overtones while anti-Jammu reaction in the valley tended to become anti-Hindu and hostile to rest of the country.[140] Dr. S.P. Mukherjee entered into a long correspondence with Pt. Nehru and Sheikh Abdullah but nothing substantial came out. Finally the three communal parties of India, Jan Sangh, Ram Rajya Parshid and Hindu Maha Sabha came together in a bid to organise the movement in Delhi proper.[141]

A chain of multiple reactions had followed Sheikh Abdullah's attitude towards Jammu, the agitation of Praja Parshid, the role of its sympathetic organisations in India, its reaction in valley and counter-reaction in India, the planned process of precipitating a conflict between Kashmiri Nationalism and Dogra Nationalism, Ladakh and Doda's and Jammu's demand for internal autonomy had created conditions favourable for the disintegration of state and disruption of the unity of its people.[142]

Even the basic principles Committee was instructed to study the idea of extending autonomy to different cultural units of the state - the valley, Jammu, Gilgit, Ladakh and region consisting of the districts of Mirpur, Rajouri, Poonch and Muzzafrabad.[143]

Pakistan, on the other hand, while taking the advantage of this new situation, tried to misinterpret the then emerging public opinion on Kashmir as chauvinstic and to exploit the parochial sentiments of the Dogra nationalism as well as the religious feelings of the Kashmiris. This was intended to intensify their sense of insecurity and to create doubts in their minds as to whether India would stay secular after Pt. Nehru's death.[144]

All this created political instability, suspense, uncertainity and economic stress. There was also an apprehension that the Kashmiri leaders might alienate the popular support in the valley and provide a handle to the secessionists.[145]

Under these compelling circumstances a special session of the working committee of the National Conference was called at the residence of Sheikh Abdullah in Srinagar in May 1953.[146]

One of the three main issues which came up for discussion was the political situation vis-a-vis Indo-Pak dispute over Kashmir. The committee after a prologned discussion came to the unanimous conclusion that the internal stability of the state was impossible so long as international settlement on the final position of the state not achieved. An eight members sub-committee[147] was appointed to explore avenues of an honourable settlement of the issue.

The sub-committee adopted the following proposals of possible alternative for an honourable and peaceful solution of the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan.[148]

a) overall Plebiscite

b) Independence of the whole state;

c) independence of whole state with joint Indo-Pak control of foreign affairs and defence; and

d) Dixon plan with independence for the Plebiscite area.

This followed a period of studied inactivity and deliberate side-tracking of the main issue of completing the constitution[149]

Meanwhile, by the sudden death of Dr. S.P. Mukerjee, the then President of the Akhil Bharatiya Jan Sangh and the leader of opposition in Lok Sabha on June 23, 1953, in detention at Srinagar, the whole of north India was plunged in profound grief and submerged by a kind of anti Nehru and anti-Abdullah wave.

The rightist parties in the state as well as in India refused to believe that it was a natural death. Rather they described it as death in mysterious circumstances.[150]

The rumbling of similar reactions were also heard in the frontier district of Ladakh.[151] Simultaneously there were inflamatory reports that Sheikh Abdullah was to declare Kashmir as independent, the idea of which was said to be mooted by Mr. and Mrs. Hunderson and Stevenson, during their visit to Kashmir in May 1953, and also promised American support to the move.[152] Tragedy was that Sheikh Abdullah was misunderstood and his urge for maximum autonomy for the state was just taken for independence.

An open rift in the camp of National Conference suddenly developed. At a working Committee meeting Pt. P.L. Saraf gave expression to his views in regard to Kashmir's relationship with India, which did not square with Sheikh Abdullah's new approach to the problem. Moreover, there were some charges of nepotism against Mr. S.L. Saraf. As a result there were some sharp exchanges between him and Prime Minister in a cabinet meeting held on August 6, 1953.[153] This was followed by a letter from Sheikh Abdullah demanding Saraf's resignation.[154] But Pt. S.L. Saraf refused to do so. Re-affirming his loyalty to the National Conference he made no attempt to conceal the fact that his few other colleagues also thoroughly disapproved Abdullah's new orientation of policy.[155]

On August 7, 1953 three members of the Cabinet led by G.M. Bakshi accused Sheikh Abdullah in a memorandum, sent to Sadar-i-Riyasat, of making arbitrary decisions, inefficiency and unwanted wastage of public resources, and alleged that the cabinet had lost the confidence of the people.[156] Sheikh Abdullah was summoned by the Sadar-i-Riyasat who suggested an emergency meeting of the state cabinet for free and frank discussion at the palace.[157] But he refused and left for Gulmarg to spend the weekened.[158]

The climax of the tragic drama came on August 8, 1953, when Sheikh Abdullah ministry was dismissed and Bakshi Ghulam Mohd,

was asked to form a new ministry in the state.[159]

Thus, in the early hours of August 9, 1953, Sheikh Abdullah was arrested and was given a letter of his dismissal alongwith another letter signed by G.M. Bakshi, S.L. Saraf and G.L. Dogra out of five members of then state cabinet indicating that they all had lost confidence in his leadership.[160]

Mr. M.A. Beg another member of the Cabinet, alongwith thirty three leaders of the National conference were also arrested on August 9 & 10 under the public Security Act.[161] The crisis of August 1953 was, however, the result of the motivational variations arising out of varied political considerations and failure of the leadership at various levels to reconcile the various claims and aspirations.[162] Many birds were, thus killed with one single stone of dismissal and arrest of Sheikh Abdullah. Pt. Nehru was again riding on the crest of a popular wave.[163]

But Sheikh Abdullah martyrdom on August 9 had made him a popular hero of Kashmir once again.

The rightist parties in Jammu which were never completely reconciled to the limited state accession to India, the special status of Kashmir under Art 370 of the Constitution of India abolition of Monarchy, the Delhi Agreement of 1952 and even the proposal of giving autonomy to different cultural units of state were not only happy but welcomed the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah. The Praja Parshid leadership even withdrew their Satyagrah and promised to render all sort of help to G.M. Bakshi - the new Prime Minister if he would bring state more closer to the Indian Union.

All the rightist parties in the valley, on the other hand condemned the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah. They regarded it as coup and the first act of murder of democracy. They argued that arbitrary removal of the leader of the house Sheikh Abdullah from premiership without the formal vote of no-confidence against him was without a parallel in the history of democracy. His arrest led to the spontaneous protest from every nook and corner of Kashmir and almost all the rightist parties and religious groups registered their unequivocal condemnation against it.

The adoption of the Jammu and Kashmir Constitution of 1957

The report of the Drafting Committee, submitted on February

11,1954[164] to the Kashmir consembly was none else then the Draft Constitution of the State. It was based, as far as possible, on the decisions taken by the consembly on the reports of the Basic Principles Committee, the advisory Committee on Fundamental Rights and Citizenship, and such other decisions as were taken from time to time.

The report also annexed the provisions of the constitution of India which, in addition to Article 1 and Articles 370, alongwith exceptions and modifications, if any, would apply in relation to the state of Jammu and Kashmir.[165]

The deliberation on the report started on February 13, 1956, continued for three days and with slight modifications was unanimously adopted by the consembly.[166] As a result the Draft Constitution was submitted to the consembly on October 10, 1956. The fundamental features of the Draft Constitution were parliamentary democracy; responsibility of the Executive to the legislature; joint responsibility of the cabinet, separation of the various powers of the state i.e. Executive, Legislative and Judicial and finally the Rule of Law.[167] It laid down that the future relation of the State with India would be that the state was an integral and inalienable part of India and would ever remain so.[168] All those powers which necessarily must belong to the centre had been given to the Union Government.[169] Moreover, all those powers which were already with the centre, had been left as such.[170] The Draft mentioned that the state would consist of all those territories which had been under the control of the former ruler till 1947.[171]

Rights of the permanent residents of the state had been secured while they would also enjoy fully the benefits and rights of the citizenship of India. Residents of the state were as good citizens of India as were the residents of various states of the union. A chapter on Directive Principles of the State Policy had also been added to the Draft Constitution.[172]

There would be a Head of the State known as the Sadar-i-Riyasat. He would be elected by the legislature of the state. In addition to Council of Minister, it provided for an Advocate General for the state. So far as legislature was concerned, the Draft Constitution recommended a bi-cameral legislature for the state.[173] It also provided for the separation of Judiciary from Executive.[174] If Executive would deviate from the principles laid down in the Constitution, the Judiciary was there to guarantee justice.[175]

The Draft Constitution provided for setting up a Public Service Commission, Election Commission procedure for the amendment of the constitution,[176] provision against constitutional breakdown and provisions for carrying on the functions of the government during the transitional period.[177]

The Auditor General of India would audit the account of the state and would submit his report through the Sadar-i-Riyasat of the state for discussion by the House.[178]

The method of election, emoluments, allowances and privileges of the Sadar-i-Riyasat, salaries, allowances of Speaker and Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Legislative Council, the Judges of the high Court and regional languages were shown in separate schedules attached to the Draft Constitution.[179]

Thus, the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir which comprised of 158 articles and six schedules was enforced on January 26, 1957.

The Praja Parishad as the leading rightist party of Jammu was against the enactment of a separate constitution. It had, from the very beginning, given the slogan of Ek Vidhan, Ek Pradhan and Ek Nishan. Since none of its representative was there in the Constituent Assembly, the party launched its tirade against a separate constitution from outside.[180]

The party observed a protest Day on August 5, 1956 to express people's feeling against the proposed constitution separate from India for Jammu and Kashmir state.[181] The party with the help of some other rightist groups in Jammu convened an anti-separate constitution convention on September23, 1956 in which a resolution stating that there could not be two constitutional set up in India - one for Kashmir and other for the rest of the country was passed. The resolution further pointed out that it would encourage disruptive elements in other parts of the country also. Sheikh Abdul Rehman, member of the Parishad Executive stressed that even the muslim majority in the state wanted the Indian constitution.[182] Pt. Prem Nath Dogra argued that a separate constitution for the state would encourage separatism in the state which was bound to endanger the unity of India.[183] He also pleaded that the proposed Kashmir constitution was materially different from the Indian constitution in both spirit and content and it would cause great disappointment to the people of the state and his party would oppose each

and every provision of the constitution which sought to create a distinction between Kashmir and India. He also criticised the provision for election of the head of the state, independence of the Kashmir high Court from the Supreme Court, provision for a separate Election Commission and urdu being made the official language of the state.[184]

The Dogra Sadar Sabha, the Hindus Sahayik Sabha, the state Akali Dal and other rightist groups in the Jammu region protested against the definition of state subject in the Draft Constitution and pointed out that the condition relating to the acquisition of immovable property and drawing deadline by fixing a date was unfair, arbitrary and an anachronism in the then prevailing democratic set up.[185]

The four members belonging to Plebiscite Front boycotted the proceedings of the House when the Draft Constitution of the State was presented before it on October 10, 1956. The leader of the group Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din Hamadani informed the press that they had boycotted the presentation of the Draft constitution to the House because they believed that after August 9, 1953 (the day Sheikh Abdullah was arrested) the House had lost its representative character.[186] The Plebiscite Front in a message to some Indian M.Ps said that the fascist clique thrust by the Bakshi government on Kashmiris was imposing on them a totally unacceptable constitution.[187] Mirza Afzal Beg, who was released from jail alongwith four other tabled a motion in the consembly for adjournment for two weeks so as to give adequate time to the government to arrange for the presence of Sheikh Abdullah in the House.[188] When the motion was disallowed Mirza Afzal Beg and eight other members of the Plebiscite Front walked out of the consembly after questioning its competence to frame a a Constitution.[189]

The Working Committee of the Kashmir Democratic Union, another rightist party of valley took the stand that the Draft Constitution was totally unacceptable to the Kashmiri people.[190]

Extension of Central Laws to the State, the Change of Nomenclature of Sadar-i-Riyasat and Prime Minister and Merger of the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference with Indian National Congress.

In the first phase of constitution making, which started with the state's accession to the Indian Union in October 1947 and terminated with the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah in August 1953, the policy of the National Conference leadership was to build state's Constitutional

structure on the pillars of maximum autonomy and limited integration with the Indian Union. But it failed miserably due to the constitutional crisis of 1953.

During the second phase, which started with the coming up of Ghulam Mohammad Bakshi as the Prime Minister and terminated in the middle of 1963, the policy adopted was limited autonomy for the state and partial and cautious integration of the state with the Indian union.[191]

G.M. Sadiq became the state Chief Minister in 1964 and continued till his death in December 1971. He seemed to have been impressed by the adoption of the socialistic pattern of society as the Congress goal at its Avadhi session and by the progressive policies of the then union government, regarding Privy Purses, Bank Nationalization etc. Being a progressive and nationalist leader, he regarded Article 370 as tunnel or a bridge between the State and Union. He, therefore, thought the time ripe for a progressive integration of the State with the Union and many steps were proposed to be taken in that direction. In his first policy statement in March 1964 he emphasized the need to break down the barriers that stood in the way of fuller participation of the people of the state in the broader current of national life.[192] He stressed that the declared aim of the new regime was to move towards a dynamic process of emotional integration and to achieve greater uniformity of parliamentary practice.

As a result the state government liberalised the preventive Detention Act of the state to conform to its counterpart enforced in the rest of the country in May 1964,[193] the extension to the state of Articles, 356 and 357 of the Indian constitution in July 1964, the code of civil procedure in August 1964, the Central Advocates Act in September 1964, bringing of the State Transport Act in line with the Central Act except in regard to the provision relating to penalities for offences,[194] and extension of Indian Press Bill to the State in February 1965[195]

The entries 43[196] and 78[197] of the Union and 33 and 34 [198] of the concurrent lists were also extended to the state.[199] The Kashmiri language was given recognition by incorporating it in the 8th Schedule of the Indian Constitution. During the middle of 1964 there were rumours that both the state and the central governments were in favour of opening a branch of the INC in State. Mr. Chagla, the then Education Minister pointed out that opening of a branch of the Congress in Kashmir was most essential. He further added that the National

Conference was dead and there was no political platform in the state at that movement.[200]

Mr. Sadiq, on the other hand, also stressed the need for the Congress to extend its activities to Kashmir.[201] Accordingly the Working Committees of National Conference sent its delegation to attend the Congress Session at Morepure in January 1965 to plead for the establishment of a Congress Unit in the State. As Congress high Command also supported the move the National Conference was formally replaced by the Congress party on January 26, 1965. That move further helped the state to move more closer to the centre.

In early 1965 the State Government decided to amend the State Constitution for changing the nomenclature of Sadar-i-Riyasat and Prime Minister of the State. Thus, the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir Sixth Amendment Act was passed on April 1965. With that a number of other sections of the State Constitution were, either amended[202] or modified,[203] and some new sections were also inserted.[204] Some amendments in 4th and 5th Schedules of the Jammu and Kashmir Constitution were also made. All these additions and alterations resulted in giving more and more powers to the Central government in its dealing with the State government.

Towards the end of 1965 the State Legislature passed a bill to amend the State Constitution providing for direct election of the members of Lok Sabha. This was followed by the Presidential order extending to the State Article 81 of the Union Constitution. In August 1967, the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir Eighth Amendment Bill was passed. In October 1967, the Constitution Ninth Amendment was passed and in October, 1968, the 10th Amendment Act was also passed. Similarly in October 1970 the 11th Amendment Act was enacted by the State Legislature. Then followed the extension of certain labour laws to the State.[205] From September 1, 1971 onwards some more Central Acts were extended to State.[206]

The people in general and rightist parties in particular in Jammu region hailed such a progressive integrative move of the state leadership. They saw in it partial fulfilment of their demand for fuller integration of the State with Indian Union. Moreover they urged the Indian government to further hasten the process of integration.

But the people and Rightist Parties in the valley - Plebiscite Front, political conference, Awami Action Committee, Jamaat-i-Islami and

other criticised and condemned such a move of the State government and called Sadiq as a puppet of the Central Government. The Plebiscite Front was totally against the extension of Central Laws as well as the merger of National Conference into the Indian National Congress and declared that the party would not recognise the changes which run counter to its policy. The front leaders observed January 15, 1964 as protest day against the extension to the State of emergency provisions of the Constitution of India. Mr. M.A. Beg while criticising these moves characterised them as extraordinary steps and a complete denial of democracy to Kashmiris and a move calculated to merge the State with the Indian Union.

Indira - Sheikh Accord of 1975

The Congress leadership at the Centre was keen to arrive at a sound solution because Kashmir was still being treated as international issue as was indicated by Taskant talks and Simla Agreement, and inspite of Sheikh Abdullah's arrest in August 1953 and coming up of a number of new leaders such as G.M. Bakshi, Shamsuddin, G.M. Sadiq and Mir Qasim the problem of communalism and secessionism continued not only to exist but had taken a serious dimension in the State. Moreover, people of the valley seemed to have been not pacified with different regimes since 1953. Sheikh Abdullah was still regarded as the undisputed leader of Kashmir and his influence in the political circles was still regarded as paramount, some of the Kashmiri leaders were still challenging the state's accession with Indian Union and pleading for the holding of Plebiscite to decide its finality and Pak influence on the people of the valley still increasing. Mrs. Indira Gandhi the then Prime Minister at the Centre was also seemed to have been convinced that it was not at all possible to get the popular support from the valley and finally solve the Kashmir issue without taking Sheikh Abdullah into confidence.

On the other hand the failure of Pak forces to capture Kashmir by force in the past, the then political turmoil in Pakistan because of refusal of west Pakistan to accept Majeeb-ul-Rehman of East Pakistan, whose party had secured majority in the general election, as the Prime Minister of the country, subsequent civil war in East Pakistan and commission of atrocities on the co-Muslim brethern there had deep impact on the thinking of Kashmiris elites in general and their leadership in particular. Most of them were seemed to have been

convinced that the people of the State might have met the same fate if the state, had seceded from the Indian union and acceded to Pakistan. They were also seemed to have been clear in their minds that the possibility of Kashmir to be independent was very bleak as it has been surrounded by a number of countries. They finally seemed to have been convinced that if there could be any solution of their problem it would be within the framework of Indian Constitution.

Sheikh Abdullah and his colleagues seemed to have realised that the method they had adopted in their struggle for freedom since August 1953 had practically denied the people of Kashmir right to have a government of their own choice.

Simultaneously Mr. G.M. Sadiq soon realised that his policy of progressive integration of state with the centre had failed miserably and the people of the valley were being alienated from his fold. He, therefore, embarked upon the policy of liberalization. Syed Mir Qasim, who succeeded Mr. Sadiq in December1971 and who was initially a critic of the policy of liberalism, too begin to realise the necessity and validity of that policy. He then called upon Sheikh Abdullah and other opposition leaders of the State to join the maninstream of the state political life, provided they did not transgress Constitutional limits.[207] He further admitted that Sheikh Abdullah could play a great role in strengthening the democratic and socialistic forces in the country.[208]

Thus, change in the political life of the sub-continent, the changing attitude of the central leadership and the policy of liberalisation adopted by the State government and the offer of Syed Mir Qasim to Sheikh Abdullah and others to join mainstream of the state's political life received a favourable response from Sheikh Abdullah. He in a public speech, by affirming his faith in accession, securlarism and democratic socialism, pointed out that his quarrel with India was not on the question of accession but on the quantum of autonomy of the state in its relationship with India.[209]

Such an attitude of Sheikh Abdullah encouraged Indian government to seek a compromise with him. Mrs. Gandhi also expressed her desire to turn over a new leaf in relation between India and Kashmir. As a result negotiations started between centre and state leadership to find ways for a better Constitutional relations between the Union and the state. These deliberations were later pursued by Mr. Parthasarthy as the

representative of Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. M.A. Beg as the representative of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah. Their talks were initiated at Srinagar on June 16, 1972[210] and centred around the statement of Sheikh Abdullah upholding the finality of accession to India and demanding maximum autonomy as envisaged in the instrument of accession of October 1947.

After series of discussion for about three long years in which S. Sawarn Singh, Mr. Mir Qasim and D.P.Dhar also made their contributions[211] an agreement called Indira - Sheikh Accord of 1975 was signed on February 24, 1975

Viewed in a comparative light the Accord revealed;

(i) The stress on the importance of Article 370 i.e. it reassured Kashmir's special status as given in Article 370 of the India Constitution.

(ii) Residuary powers remained with the State Legislature. However, it was admitted that power of the Parliament to take steps to safeguard the sovereignty and territorial integrity of India, the honour of the national flag, national anthem and Indian Constitution.

(iii) The result of the mutual negotiations which emerged in the shape of what was known as the Delhi-Agreement was intended to be kept intact without any alterations and as such the provisions of the Indian Constitution which had been extended to the state without any change should continue to apply.

But the state government was free to re-examine the legislations extended to state subsequent to Delhi-Agreement with modifications and could repeal them if necessary.

(iv) The power of the state government, to legislate on matters relating to welfare measures, cultural matters, social security, personal law and procedural law in the light of special conditions prevailing in the state had been safeguarded with a view to ensure the freedom of the state in such matters. Further, it has been given powers to review such legislation extended to the state since 1953 under the concurrent list by presidential orders and see if they needed any amendment or repeal so that steps might be taken to recast or re-enact such provisions under Article 254. Grant of President's assent to

such bills should be sympathetically considered, not only with regard to the intervening period but also to the future legislations of such nature, and the views of the state government would always be taken into consideration.

(v) It stated that a legislation of the State Legislature pertaining to the appointment, powers, functions, duties, privileges and immunities of the Governor should be reserved for the assent of the President. That applied also to the matters relating to the elections, including items like superintendence thereof and the adult franchise.

(vi) Regarding the nomenclature of the Governor and of the Chief Minister, who were once called Sadar-i-Riyast and Prime Minister respectively, no agreement was arrived at.[212]

From the aforesaid analysis of the Accord it may be abundantly clear that the basic fact of accession had been accepted. Constitutional relationship upto August 8, 1953 had not been questioned. But the doubts were expressed about the post-August 1953 legislation. There also had been certain provisions which referred to the possibility of revision of the then existing relations. Moreover the provisions regarding Supreme Court were to be revised and the question of nomenclature of Governor and Chief Minister had remained unresolved issue. In short, the provision of the Accord had given an impression that we were back to the earlier phase as symbolised by the Delhi Agreement of 1952, which in its turn was underpinned by Article 370 of the Indian Constitution and the state's instrument of accession to India.

The nature of reaction of the rightist parties in Jammu region towards the talks between Shri Parthasarthy and M.A. Beg was highly complicated one. They suspected that the Central Government might concede more autonomy to the state which would be contrary to the national interests. While criticising Indira - Sheikh Accord, they pointed out that Sheikh Abdullah's repeated assertions stressing the right of the state to review all the central laws exended to the state at the request of State government between August 1953 to the year of Accord, could, have no meaning, but to 'Sell the Settlement' and giving him 'Kashmir on a platter.'[213]

Their apprehensions were that the installation of Sheikh Abdullah as Chief Minister of the state was not only undemocratic but also would

lead to the emergence of separatist and disruptionist tendencies in the State.[214] They warned that any step against integration with India would be dangerously fraught with grave consequences.[215]

There was, however, mixed reaction in the valley. Inspite of the fact that all the demands of the Plebiscite leadership were not accepted, yet they seemed to be pacified with the conclusions of the Accord. Sheikh Abdullah hailed it as it strengthened his desire for maximum autonomy for the State as well as a victory of democracy and secularism. As a result, the Plebiscite Front was dissolved and National Conference revived. The Awami Action Committee, right from the very beginning opposed negotiations between Kashmir leaders and the centre and it strongly condemned the Accord.[216] Jamaat-i-Islami while rejecting the Accord questioned the wisdom of the Plebiscite Front president Mirza Afzal Beg wasting two decades to affirm the reality of Kashmir's accession to India.[217]

Re-Settlement Bill

While presenting Delhi Agreement in consembly of Kashmir Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah pointed out that it was agreed that in accordance with Article 5 of the Indian constitution person who had their domicile in Jammu and Kashmir State should be the citizen of India. It was further agreed that the State Legislature should have power to define and regulate the rights and privileges of permanent residents of the State, more especially in regard to acquisition of immovable property, appointment to services and like matters. It was also agreed that special provision should be made in the laws governing citizenship to provide for the return of those permanent residents of Jammu and Kashmir, who had gone to Pakistan during the disturbance of 1947 or in fear of them as well as those who had left for Pakistan earlier and could not return. If they return, they should be entitled to the rights, privileges and obligation of citizenship.[218] They had visualized the possibility of their return to their homes and hearths as soon as normal conditions were restored.[219]

When the consembly of Kashmir was convened in October 1951, the Advisory Committee on Fundamental Rights and Citizenship was asked to make recommendations as regards qualifications required for citizenship and the determination of Fundamental Rights of the residents of the State.[220] The Committee presented its report on February 3, 1954.[221] The final position, however, crystalised when the

Report of the Committee was unanimously adopted on February 6, 1954.[222]

Part II (See Section 6 to 10) of the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir deals with the permanent residents. The general effect of these provisions is that the separate citizenship of the state had been abolished and the laws of Indian citizenship extended to the state. The state legislature can, however, confer special rights and privileges on permanent residents of the state. Another class of persons whose interests had to be safeguarded were those who had left the state on account of the disturbance of 1947. If they return to the state under a permit for resettlement issued under the authority of the state legislature for the purpose of permanently residing in the state, then they are entitled to the rights, privileges and obligations of citizenship.

At the time of tribal raids in 1947 many families from the state had disintegrated so much so that father got separated from son, mother from her daughter and brother. This sad episode in the life of the people of the state became all the more poignant in the subsequent years when these separated families could not reunite and continued to pine and long to meet their near and dear ones separated from each other by the cruel fate. Moreover some of such state subjects were not only harassed but also tortured at the hands of Pakistani police. Some of them even lost their lives in the jails of Pak occupied Kashmir.

Some of these people contacted the state leadership and pleaded for permitting them to return and resettle on this side of the cease-fire line.[223]

As a result, a private member Bill, regulating the procedure for permanent return and settlement of these state subjects was introduced in the state Assembly by Abdul Rahim Rather belonging to the ruling National Conference in March, 1980.[224] While introducing the Bill it was argued that although provisions had existed in the Constitution of India and of the State, for near about three decades no law was made on the subject with the result that the agony of the disintegrated families was further aggrevated. Both the state and the Central governments were involved in an unending litigation in the courts of law by the affected families and enactment of law to give effect to those Constitutional provisions and to regulate the entry of such permanent residents by a proper legal procedure, became an inescapable necessity.[225] It was further pointed out that the state government was

committed to protect and safeguard the rights of such displaced persons.[226] While replying to the criticism of endangering the security of the country, the then Chief Minister pointed out that the proposed law would sufficiently safeguard the security of the state as the entry would be regulated by a prescribed procedure and only genuine state subjects would be allowed to settle after proper verification and screening leaving no scope for entry of undesirable persons.[227] The Bill was passed in 1982 and was referred to the Governor of the state for his assent.

The Governor, however returned the Bill to the state Legislature for reconsideration in September 1982.[228] The Bill was passed again in its original form. It, therefore, became an Act without the assent of the Governor. As this bill had provoked a major controversy inside and outside the state legislature and even in rest of India. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah met Mrs. Indira Gandhi and tried to resolve the crisis. Though both the leaders made a bid to end the state of confrontation, yet both followed their own ways. The doubts on the bill neither abated nor permitted the situation to go to the worse. Dr. Farooq, the new Chief Minister also visited New Delhi and entered into negotiations with Mrs. Indira Gandhi, and agreed to her proposal to refer the Bill to the Supreme Court.

All the rightist political parties in Jammu region criticised the introduction and passing of Resettlement Bill. Thakur Baldev Singh, the President of the State unit of Bharatiya Janta Party said that the Bill had several deficiencies, was beyond the jurisdiction of legislature and would open flood gates to spies to settle in the state. Other rightist groups alleged that anti-national elements were rallying behind the National Conference in its attempt to facilitate the home coming of an estimated 100,000 sons of the soil who had already acquired full fledged citizenship of Pakistan.[229] They further reiterated that the bill would give blanket citizenship to everyone from occupied Kashmir who wanted to return even if he was a spy or a convict.[230]

All the rightist parties in the valley not only supported the Bill but also put pressure on the state government and the National Conference leadership to get the Bill passed from the Legislature at the earliest. Later on they accused Dr. Farooq Abdullah for sidelining the issue inspite of the fact that the Bill had been passed by the State Legislature. They further alleged that in order to appease the central government

he entered into negotiations with Delhi for finding the ways to torpedo the Bill. They were also of the view that Bill was passed by the legislature in due recognition to human values involved in it.

Dismissal of Dr. Farooq Ministry in July 1984

Dr. Farooq Abdullah entered Kashmir politics when he was made the President of National Conference by his father Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah in 1982. During the course of his prolonged illness Sheikh Abdullah expressed his desire to make his son Dr. Farooq as his successor, ignoring his eldest son-in-law Mr. G.M. Shah who considered himself to be next in the party. Sheikh Abdullah died on September 8, 1982 and Dr. Farooq Abdullah was sworn in as the new Chief Minister of the State on a written request made by five members of Sheikh Abdullah's Ministry.

As the next state Assembly elections were due in mid 1983, all the political parties, therefore, started entering into compromises and alliances to get support of each other. Prolonged negotiations were also started between National Conference and Congress-I for the alliance and sharing of assembly seats for the coming elections but nothing substantial came out and the negotiations ended in failure. When no settlement was reached between them about the sharing of assembly seats particularly in the valley, both the parties decided to contest on their own.[231]

As National Conference and congress leadership wanted to prove their respective strength in the valley, both parties started their election campaign simultaneously, Mrs. Indira Gandhi and other top Congress leaders toured whole of the State but particularly concentrated on the valley.

The National Conference leadership, on the other hand, entered in to dialogue with some rightist parties of the valley such as Awami Action Committee, Jamaat-e-Islami, Jamaat-e-Tulba and succeeded in getting their support.

During the course of their campaign, some of the party leaders of the above mentioned rightist parties made inflamatory speeches, even challenged the validity of accession, pleaded for cession, shouted Pro-Pak slogans, and raised Pak flags. Even Mrs. Indira Gandhi was jeered and some insulting remarks were made against her when she was addressing

a public meeting at Iqbal Park Srinagar. They also raised slogans that Islam was in danger and the future of Muslims was in-secure with North Indian Hindu communalists, encouraged violence, whipped up narrow sectarian, parochial, regional and communal feelings and caused deterioration of law and order situation.[232] National Conference leadership did not use it influence to check these anti-Indian activities. All this further widened the gap not only between the secessionists and integrationists forces and groups but also between the Central and State leadership. The politics of the state was broadly polarised between Congress-I and the National Conference which tended to eliminate smaller parties.[233]

The elections to the State Legislature were held in June 1983, while National Conference got overwhelming majority in the Assembly, Congress -I suffered a crushing defeat particularly in the valley. The party position and the percentage of votes polled in favour of each party are shown in the following table:

TABLE NO. 18

The Party Position and the Percentage of Votes Polled in Their Favour

S. No.	Name of the Political Parties	Seats Contested	Won	Total No. of Votes	Percentage of Votes
1.	The All J&K National Conference	75	46	9,15,595	41.61
2.	Congress-I	72	26	6,40,095	29.13
3.	B.J.P.	27	--	67,574	3.08
4.	Janta Party	10	--	5,303	0.24
5.	Panther Party	30	1	17,466	1.71
6.	People Conference	38	1	1,00,209	4.50
7.	Jammat-e-Islami	25	--	72,632	3.37
8.	Lok Dal	7	--	1,179	0.05
9.	Community Party	4	--	2,933	0.74
10.	Independence	22	1	35,1968	15.90

Source: Report of Seventh Assembly Election 1983, Jammu and Kashmir Government, Srinagar.

Both the parties accused each other for indulging in violence in the State during elections. Addressing a well attended election meeting Farooq Abdullah charged that Congress-I was using violent means in an act of desperation for fear of impending rejection by the electorate in the valley.[234]

Defeat in elections is a normal phenomenon in a parliamentary democracy. All political parties in a democratic set up are supposed to accept and submit to the verdict of the masses, whether in favour or against them. But the Congress-I in Jammu and Kashmir claimed exception by refusing to accept the defeat in the elections. Rather it challenged the election results from the day these were declared. Party organ 'Khidmat' interpreted elections as "fraud with the voters of the State". Even Mrs. Gandhi, while accusing National Conference pointed out that strong-arm methods and violence resorted to by the party showed as to what the party stood for in the absence of a programme for development.[235]

Dr. Farooq Abdullah, on the other hand criticised Congress-I and Central leadership for playing toppling game in Jammu and Kashmir with the support of G.M. Shah, who was trying to come close to Pradesh Congress through Devi Dass Thakur - a member of Sheikh Abdullah's last Cabinet.

Although Congress-I had adopted confrontionist attitude after the elections of 1983, yet Dr. Farooq Abdullah had appealed to the State Congress-I for its co-operation and participation in the efforts of development in the state. He also wanted to patch up with the Central leadership.[236] He was of the view that the Centre -State relations should always be normal. If there was bitterness between them the poor people of the State would suffer.[237] But Congress-I responded negatively to that offer. The State Congress-I General Secretary, Malik Mohi-ud-Din alleged that large scale rigging in elections and butchering of democracy in the state by National Conference would not be tolerated.[238] Moreover, the Election Commission and the Central government had received thousands of telegrams from voters in the state alleging that 5000 or more ballots were stuffed in the ballot boxes in each constituency in order to improve the chances of National Conference candidates. Reports also indicated out that in some constitutencies the number of ballot papers counted was for in excess of total number of votes polled.[239] It was further pointed out that National Conference alliance with Awami Action

Committee, whose Chairman Maulvi Farooq did not admit himself to be an Indian citizen and who disputed the validity of accession of the state with the Indian Union, and seeking the support of state unit of Akali Dal were glaring and unmistakable gestures towards pro-Pakistan elements.[240]

Meanwhile Dr. Farooq Abdullah attended the opposition conclave at Bangalore,entered in to prolonged negotiations with opposition leaders particularly N.T. Rama Rao, Jyoti Basu, Ram Krishan Hegde and others, and hoisted the third opposition conclave at Srinagar much against the wishes of the Central leadership.[241] It was reported that he also met Sant Bhinderwale in Amritsar.

The three days opposition conclave of the opposition leaders started at Srinagar on October 5, 1983 in which 59 leaders representing 17 parties participated. While discussing administrative, economic, political, financial and constitutional aspects of centre-state relations, the powers and appointment of governors, appointment and transfers of High Court judges, the President's power to dismiss state governments, declaration of emergency and devolution of finances etc. Political leaders alleged that excessive and unfettered powers exercised by the Centre by committing breach of constitutional conventions, and misuse of constitutional provisions, had eroded whatever little autonomy was given to the states. The result was that the states were unable to manage their own affairs without the Central aid and approval.[242]

Mr. G.M.Shah who was leading National Conference 'K' faction opposed the move of convening opposition conclave at Srinagar. In a statement he reiterated that such a move would create more misunderstanding between the central and state leadership.

The opposition conclave in Srinagar, however, brought more confrontation with the centre and the Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi described it as a conspiracy of the opposition leaders to overthrow her from power.[243] Congress-I then intensified the propaganda campaign in order to create the impression that Dr. Farooq Abdullah was emerging as a threat to the integrity and security of the country and the only solution left was the Central intervention. The then PCC(I) Chief of the State, Mufti Mohd Syed even reiterated that Dr. Farooq had strengthened the hands of those who wanted to weaken the centre for separatist ends and thus wanted to destroy the stability of the country.[244]

Meanwhile the one day international cricket match between India and West Indies was held at Srinagar. Just after the start of the match

some hooligans started raising anti-Indian slogans, pelted stones on the police and manhandled Indian players. The Central Government took a very serious note of the incident which further aggrevated the political situation in the state. Some of the Congress-I members of parliament while accusing the Nationals Conference leadership pointed out that Dr. Farooq Abdullah had created ideal conditions for the growth of extremist and pro-Pakistan elements in the State.[245] Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, the Congress-I General Secretary visited Srinagar and a public meeting hinted that centre could not afford to ignore its obligations when a dangerous situation was being created in the state. He further added that it would act howsoever harsh that action might be.[246]

The climax of political drama came on July 2, 1984 when 12 members of the Assembly belonging to National Conference and one independent member accompanied G.M. Shah to the governor of the State alongwith Iftikar Ansari, the leader of Congress-I legislature party and pleaded that Dr. Farooq Abdullah had lost the confidence of the majority in the assembly and therefore had lost the constitutional and moral right to continue in office.[247] The Governor of the State Mr. Jagmohan summoned Dr. Farooq Abdullah to Raj Bhawan and told him that he had lost the majority support in the Assembly. Dr. Farooq Abdullah pleaded that loss of confidence be decided on the floor of the Assembly within one month and if that was not agreed to, the Assembly be dissolved. The governor did not find any justification in accepting either of the two suggestions. He then dismissed Dr. Abdullah ministry and appointed G.M. Shah as Chief Minister of the State.[248] He, was, however asked to prove his majority on the floor of the House within one month.

The rightist parties in Jammu exhibited mixed reaction to the dismissal of Dr. Abdullah Ministry. Most of the rightist parties of Hindus alongwith the Congress-I welcomed it whereas others treated such an action as undemocratic. They were of the view that the question of majority in favour or against the elected government in a democratic set up should be decided on the floor of the House.

But most of the rightist parties in the valley while condemning the State Governor's action of dismissing popularly elected ministry of Dr. Farooq said that it was a murder of democracy and undemocratic intervention of the centre in the State affairs. They pleaded that the only remedy of all such ills was nothing less than the cecession of the State

from the Indian Union.

Dismissal of G.M. Shah's Ministry, Imposition of Governor's Rule and Rajiv-Farooq Accord

G.M. Shah of National Conference (K), who succeeded Farooq Abdullah as the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir State won a vote of confidence from the State Assembly with Congress-I support but only after removing the Speaker Wali Mohammad Itoo and walkout staged by the National Conference(F). National Conference(F) leadership, on the other hand, pleaded that floor crossing by some of its legislators was a clear cut case of defection which was not permitted by anti-defection bill of the State. The matter was ultimately referred to the Jammu and Kashmir High Court. But the Constitutional bench of High Court dismissed the petition on the plea that it was not a case of defection but factionalism as both the factions National Conference(K) and National Conference(F) belonged to the same party.[249]

The National Conference(F) leadership then started challenging the validity of the action of the Governor in dismissing Farooq ministry. They were of the view that Governor, by not granting sufficient time to the then Chief Minister to prove his strength on the floor of the house before the dismissal of the ministry, acted in a partisan style. Some of their leaders also pleaded that the office of the Sadar-i-Riyast being the head of the State, as provided by Kashmir's Constitution of 1957, be revived. Thus a campaign against the office of the Governor and its powers was started by the party. All this created further irritations and tensions in the Constitutional relationship between the Centre and the State.[250]

Congress(I) had installed G.M. Shah with the hope that he would not only move finally to break up the hegemony of Sheikh Abdullah's family on Kashmir politics but also destroy the National Conference(F) as an organisation.[251] But after becoming the Chief Minister, Mr. Shah had no intention to do all that. On the other hand, Khalida Shah and her younger sister Suriya had been secretly trying to promote a re-mearger of National Conference(K) and National Conference(F).[252] As a result Congress leadership at the centre as well as at the State level felt disappointed. The honeymoon between National Conference(K) and Congress(I), therefore, did not last long.

While assuming office Mr. G.M. Shah made tall promises to the people of the State to revamp the economy, give fair administration,

eradicate corruption in all walks of life, do justice to the people of all the three regions of the State and to bring about communal harmony among the people.[253] All these promises remained unfulfilled. Rather corruption, nepotism, malpractices, mismanagement, activising and encouraging secessionists from inside and outside of the State were at the peak during his time. Law and order had completely broken down. All the democratically elected institutions were suppressed. Recruitment boards were abolished and appointments were made out of political considerations. Valley had almost been engulfed in violence. The newly formed communal and reactionary political organisations Muslim United Front in the Valley and Shiv Sena in Jammu were busy in creating religious tensions in the State. As these communal elements were operating unchallenged, they played havoc with the peace of the State. The riots in Anantnag were the worst of their kind.[254] All this further damaged the cordial relations between the centre and the state.

The State Unit of the Congress(I), fearing loss of public credibility, therefore, started not only critising G.M. Shah but also pressing central leadership to remove him as Chief Minister. Union Home Minister S.B. Chavan and Minister of Internal Security Arun Nehru visited the State to take stock of the situation. Kashmiri Pandits, on the other hand, demonstrated in Delhi against the happenings in the valley. The Congress(I) high command, therefore, signalled to Mufti Mohammad Syed to withdraw support to G.M. shah's ministry. As a result Maulvi Iftkar Hussain Ansari, the leader of the Congress legislature party, sent a letter to the State Governor indicating his party's decision to withdraw support to the National Conference(K).

After assessing the whole political situation in the state, the state Governor Jagmohan dismissed G.M. Shah's ministry and imposed Governor's rule in March 1986.[255] On the expiry of Governor's rule after six months, the state was put under the President rule on September 6, 1986 for the first time.[256]

The top Congress(I) leadership had tried all possible alternatives to establish their party's foothold in the valley but failed as the parliamentary elections of 1984 in the State had proved it. Rajiv Gandhi and some of his party leaders were then convinced that Dr. Farooq Abdullah, the President of National conference(F)would be the only ultimate choice to improve not only the conditions in the State but bring to rest all controversies pertaining to Kashmir's constitutional relationship with

centre. They were also of the opinion that confrontation between National Conference(F) and Congress(I) had proved determental not only for the people of the State but also disrupted its communal harmony and endangered peace and stability.[257]

Dr. Farooq Abdullah, on the other hand, was convinced that though he would be able to secure majority in the elections even with out the support of Congress(I), yet he would not be allowed to remain in power for long without the confidence and co-operation of Congress(I) leadership. He also realised that the policy of confrontation that he had pursued with the centre for two years had cost the state people dearly.[258] As a result, he started dialogue with Rajiv Gandhi for patching up the differences and for bringing peace and stability in the State.

After eight months of painstaking negotiations between Rajiv Gandhi and Farooq Abdullah, in which the later assured that he was prepared to play a leading role in fighting out the anti-national forces in Kashmir, an accord between them was reached.[259] Thus, an interim coalition government of National Conference(F)and Congress(I) headed by Farooq Abdullah was sworn in on November 6, 1986. As one of the conditions of this Accord was to hold fresh elections in the State the 7th State Assembly was dissolved on November 7, 1986 by the Governor of the State and fresh elections were ordered.

The terms of Rajiv-Farooq Accord; were not made public and most of the top leaders of both the parties did not know anything about them in details. The researcher, however, tried to find them out from the old seasoned politicians and journalists,[260] who were of the view that some of the agreed terms of the Accord were:-

(1) As the ideology of both Congress(I) and National Conference (F) was based on securalism, socialism, unity and integrity of India, they would support and co-operate with each other and would not waste their energies for fighting with each other.

(2) Both would join their hands against secessionist, communalist and extremist forces on political front and otherwise in the State;

(3) Coalition government of both the parties would be formed before and after 1987 elections, and

(4) Certain seats in the valley would not only be left for the Congress candidates in the coming assembly elections but National Conference (F) would also support these candidates.

The rightist parties in Jammu region condemned the Accord. The leadership of Bharatiya Janta Party[261] describe it as an unholly alliance, an attempt by power hungry politicians to grab the seat of power at the cost of national interests.

The rightist parties in the valley were also critical of the Accord and described it as a sell out.[262] The right wing Jamaat-e-Islami branded the Accord as a friendship between a Muslim and a Kafir.[263] Dr. Qazi Nissar, leader of Muslim United Front, while condemning the Accord pointed out that it would work till both the leaders were on the chairs of power and not afterwards.[264] The other rightist parties and groups in Kashmir described the Accord as a "division of spoils" between the two parties and an understanding reached in utter disregard of the interest of the people.[265]

Rajiv-Farooq Accord of 1986 could not achieve anything worthwhile. The secessionist and communal forces not only organised themselves afresh in a big way but also co-operated with each other in their bid to weaken the patriotic forces in the State. The Kashmir Liberation Front and scores of other militant and secessionist groups surfaced in the valley after 1987 and started their subversive activities with a view to destablise the secular, nationalist and integrationalist forces in the valley in order to achieve their goal i.e. secession of Kashmir from the Indian Union. In fact, the seeds of present political turmoil in the valley were shown on the day the Rajiv-Farooq Accord was signed.[266]

FOOT NOTE

1 Tiwari, Uma Kant,: *The Making of the Indian Constitution* Allahabad, Central Book Depot; 1969, P.15

2. India and Kashmir - *Constitutional Aspect* Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Jammu and Kashmir Govt. Year not mentioned, P.12

3. Philips, C.H. and Wain Wright: *The Partition of India - Policies and Perspective* - London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1970, P.220

4. Mahajan, Mehar Chand ; *Kashmir Problem in its True Perspective* An article in Hindustan Standard (New Delhi) June 3, 1957, P.6

5. Zutshi, J.N.,: *Kashmir's Journey to Freedom* The Kashmir Bureau of Information, P.1,5, Prithvi Raj Road, New Delhi.

6. Menon, V.P.,: *The Story of Integration of Indian States* New Delhi, Orient Longman 1969, P.377

7. Mahajan, Mehar Chand; *Kashmir Problem in its True Perspective* Hindustan Stand, June 4. 1957, P.6

8. Mahajan, Mehar chand ; *Looking Back* Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1963, P.155

9. Sikri Commission Report, Government Press Srinagar, 1980 Volume 1, P.50

10. For details see the schedule enclosed with the instrument of accession - Appendix No.1

11. The Constituent Assembly Debate, Volume No.IV, No.-1, 1954, P.1

12. The Constituent Assembly Debate. Volume No.VIII No.-1, 1954,P.1

13. The Constituent Assembly Debate, Volume No.VIII, No.-4, dated February 6, 1954, P.46

14. Hindustan Times (New Delhi)November 12, 1951, P.1

15. The Tribune (Ambala) January 17, 1952, P.2

16. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) December 7, 1952, P.9

17. Front (Srinagar) December 9, 1964. All Jammu and Kashmir Plebiscite Front publication.

18. White Paper on the Constitutional relationship of Kashmir with India issued by Jammu and Kashmir Plebiscite Front. (Srinagar, Delite Press, 1964).

19. Khan, G.H.,; *Government And Politics of Jammu and Kashmir* Rawalpora Srinagar, 154 Govt. Housing Colony, 1988, P.468

20. Saraf Om,: *Crucial Choice Conforts Jamaat-e-Islami* An article in 'The Kashmir Times' July 4, 1989, P.4.

21. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) September 10, 1989, P.1

22. Nayar Kuldip,: *Where Do We Go From Here* An article in The Kashmir Times, January 19, 1990, P.4

23. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) September 10, 1989, P.1

24. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) September 22, 1989, P.1

25. Interview with Mohammad Shafi Khan, the Awami Action Committee nominee in the National Conference Legislature Party at M.L.A. Hostel, Jammu on December 11, 1989.

26. Dass, Durga,: *Sardar Patel's Correspondence* New Delhi, Navjeevan Publications 1953, P.226

27. Ibid., P.303, 304

28. Supreme Court in Puran Lal Lakhanpal Vs. President of India, 1961.

29. Lakhanpal, P.L.: *Essential Notes and Documents on Kashmir Dispute* Delhi, International Books, 1952, P.310

30. Article 370, Clause C & D

31. Kaul, Santosh,; *Evaluation of Constitution Relationship Between Jammu and Kashmir State and the Indian Union.* Ph.D Thesis unpublished, Jammu University, 1976, P.63

32. Ibid., P.65

33. A memorandum found in the old files of Praja Parshid in its Jammu Office. Date and year not mentioned

34. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) November 12, 1951, P.4
35. Detail regarding the Praja Parshid stand on Article 370 can be found in the pamphalet entitled, 'Jammu Rejects a Separate Constitution'. Published by All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parshid, 1952
36. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) September 26, 1989, P.7
37. The Hindustan times (New Delhi) March, 14, 1990, P.5
38. Ibid
39. An interview with Sheikh Ghulam Mohammad Bhandarwahi Ex-Vice-President, Plebiscite Front, at his residence on December 12, 1989.
40. Interview with Abdul Razak, Jamaat M.L.A. on December 11, 1989 at M.L.A. Hostel, Jammu.
41. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) December 3, 1989, P.1
42. Ibid
43. Saraf, Mohammad Yusaf,: *Kashmir Fight For Freedom* Lahore, Ferozson, 1980, P.337
44. Ibid., P.338
45. I. Memorial submitted by All Jammu and Kashmir Muslims, Srinagar, October 19, 1931.

    II. Memorial submitted by Kashmiri Pandits Srinagar October 24, 1931.

    III. Memorial submitted by the Sikhs October 24, 1931.

    IV. Memorial submitted by the Hindus of the state, October 29, 1931.

    V. Memorial submitted by the Rajputs of the State, October 31, 1931.
46. All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference "Naya Kashmir" (New Delhi, Kashmir Bureau of Information 1949).
47. Bhushan, Vidya,: *State Politics And Government* Jammu, Jay Kay Book House, 1985, P.81
48. The Hindu (Madras) June 26, 1949, P.81
49. Ibid
50. For details see Article 370 Clause II of the Constitution of India
51. Bhushan, Vidya,: Op.cit.,P.82
52. Constituent Assembly for Jammu and Kashmir - Resolution adopted by the General Council of All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference on October 27, 1950. Published by B.P. Sharma, Principal Information Officer,Jammu and Kashmir Government. Year not mentioned, P.1
53. Jammu and Kashmir Gazette Extra-ordinary dated Ist May, 1951. J&K Government Archives Department, Record office Library, Old Secretariat, Jammu.
54. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) December 18, 1950
55. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) November 11, 1951, P.4
56. Ibid

57. Ibid

58. Dawn (Karachi) November 1, 1950.

59. Bhushan, Vidya, : Op.cit., P.85

60. Ibid.

61. Husand, Young Francis,: *Northern Frontier of Kashmir* New Delhi, Macmillan India 1973, P.71

62. Moza, Meenakashi,: *Land Reforms in Jammu and Kashmir* An article in Vitasta', Sudi Printers, Calcutta, 1981, P.63

63. 'Naya Kashmir', Published by K.N. Bomzai, the Director Bureau of Information, 5 Prithvi Raj Road, New Delhi. Year not mentioned. P.25

64. Land Reforms in Jammu and Kashmir. Published by Government of Jammu and Kashmir, Government Press, Srinagar, 1953.

65. Ibid.

66. Towards Solvency, Published by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir, 1952, P.5

67. Moza, Meenakashi,: Op.cit., P.67

68. Anand, Adarsh,: Op.cit.,P.142

69. Constituent Assemby Debates, Volume II, No.5 March 31, 1952, P.11

70. Moza, Meenakashi,: Op.cit.,P.67

71. Ibid., P.68

72. Ibid., P.69

73. Puri, Balraj,: *Jammu - A Clue to Kashmir Tangle* New Delhi, Photo Flash Press, 1966, P.80

74. Ibid

75. The Hindu (Madras) October10, 1952.

76. 'Programme', A Pamphlet published by All Jammu and Kashmir Praja Parshid, Jammu, Janta Printing Press 1951, P.8

77. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) November 12, 1951, P.4

78. 'Front' Party Organ, All Jammu and Kashmir Plebiscite Front, June 11, 1957.

79. Khan, G.H., Op.cit., p.470

80. Bhushan, Vidya, : Op.cit., P.178

81. Bomzai, P.N.K.,: *History of Kashmir* Delhi, Metropolitan Book Co.; 1973, P.665

82. Anand, Adarsh,: *The Development of the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir* New Delhi, Light & Life Publishers 1980, Appendix II (Treaty of Amritsar 1946)

83. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah's opening address to the Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly, Srinagar, November 5, 1951, P.5,6.

84. Constituent Assembly debate. Vol. III, No.2 dated 10.6.1952.

85. Constituent Assembly debate; Volume III No.3 dated 11.6.1952.

86. Ibid., Vol. III dated 12.6.1952.

87. The Statesman (New Delhi) November 15, 1952.

88. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi)November 12, 1952, P.4

89. Bhushan, Vidya,; Op.cit., P.180

90. The Statesman (Calcutta), August 14, 1952, P.5

91. Bazaz, P.N.,: *History of Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir* New Delhi, Pomposh Publications 1954,P.64

92. Bomzai, P.N.K.,: Op.cit, P.750

93. *Search Light on Jammu Agitation*
A pamphlet issued by the Information Officer, Kashmir Bureau of Information, New Delhi, Year not mentioned, P.19

94. 'The Flag Issue' - A Pamphlet issued by the Kashmir Bureau of Information, New Delhi, year not mentioned, P.1

95. Ibid

96. Constituent Assembly Debate Volume III No.1 dated June 7, 1952,P.8

97. The Tribune (Ambala) February 4, 1952, P.3

98. The Press Note issued by the Jammu and Kashmir Government on February 9, 1952.

99. Constituent Assembly Debate, Volume III No.1, dated June 7,1952.

100. Constituent Assembly Debate, Vol.V No.2 dated November 12, 1952, P.11

101. Ibid

102. Ibid

103. Ibid., P.7-11

104. Ibid.P.11

105. Ibid. P.12

106. The Times of India (Bombay) July 10, 1952.

107. Ibid

108. Amrit Bazar Patrika (Calcutta) July 14, 1952.

109. Constituent Assembly Debate. Volume II No.1 dated 24.3.1952

110. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) April 9, 1952.

111. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) April 10, 1952.

112. Ibid.

113. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan,; *Jammu And Kashmir* Martinus/Nijhoff/The Haque/1960 P.196

114. National Herald (New Delhi) April 13, 1952.

115. The Statesman (Delhi) April 12, 1952.

116. The Statesman (New Delhi) July 18, 1952.

117. Birdwood, Lord,: *Two Nations and Kashmir* London, R. Hale, 1956, P.223

118. Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly Debates. Volume IV No.1 August 11, 1952, P.11

120. *Kashmir's Special Status*
A Pamphlet published by Ghulam Mohi-ud-Din Shah, the General Secretary, All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, Mujahid Manzil Srinagar. Year not mentioned, P.16

121 Ibid.

122. Ibid.

123. Gupta Jyoti Bhushan: Op.cit., P.187

124. Ibid

125. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) September 9, 1952.

126. *Nehru - Abdullah Pact : An Unholy Agreement and Fraud* A Pamphlet published by Praja Parshid, Year not mentioned P.2,3

127. Interview with Sheikh Ghulam Mohammad Bhandarwahi, the Vice-President of Plebiscite Front at his residence on 24.12.1989.

128. Interview with Abdul Razak, the Jamaat-e-Islami M.L.A. at the M.L.A. Hostel on 11.12.1989.

129. Interview with Mohammad Shafi Khan and Mohammad Shafi Pir, the Awami Action Committee Nominees in the National Conference Legislature Party at M.L.A. Hostel on 11.12.1989.

130. The Organiser (New Delhi) October 27, 1952.

131. *Doda District* A Pamphlet published by Abdul Ghani Goni, dated July 24, 1953.

132. Ibid

133. Ibid

134. Papers found in the old files of Jan Sangh Head Office, Jammu, year not mentioned.

135. Koenbel, Joseph,: *Danger in Kashmir* London, Princeton University Press 1954, P.235

136. The Hindustan Standard (New Delhi) November 15, 1952.

137. Bomzai, P.N.K., History of Kashmir, Op.cit. 722

138. Vigil - A Political Weekly published by Manoranjan Guha (Delhi), February 13, 1953, P.5

139. Organiser Volume VI, No.VI dated November 22, 1952.

140. Bhushan Vidya,: Op.cit., P.183

141. Kashmir Affairs - A bi-monthly Volume II No.3, January, February 1960, P.41

142. Bhushan, Vidya,: Op.cit., P.184

143. Karbel Josef,: Op.cit., P.234

144. Bhushan Vidya,: Op.cit., P.187

145. Ibid, P.187

146. *Sheikh Abdullah - Sadiq Correspondence August to October 1956.* Published by Mridula Sarabhai 81/48 Chanakya Puri, New Delhi Year not mentioned, P.17

147. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: Op.cit. P.206. The eight members were: (1) Sheikh Abdullah, (2) Maulana Masoodi, (3) M.A. Beg. (4) Bakshi Ghulam Mohd. (5) G.M. Sadiq, (6) Sardar Budh Singh, (7) Pt. G.L. Dogra and (8) S.L. Saraf.

148. Sheikh Abdullah - Sadiq Correspondence,: Op..cit.

149. Ibid.

150. Gundevia, Y.D.,: *The Testament of Sheikh Abdullah* Dehra Dun, Palit And Palit, 1974, P.42,43

151. Bhushan, Vidya,: Op.cit.,P.189

152. Karbel, Josef,: Op.cit.,P.237

153. Bhushan, Vidya,: Op.cit.,P.190

154. Bird Wood,Lord,: Op.cit.,P.158

155. Ibid.

156. The Times of India (Bombay) August 10, 1953.

157. Bird Wood, Lord,: Op.cit., P.158

158. J&K Chronical -A magazine published from Jammu, February 1976, P.10 -12.

159. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,: Op.cit., P.208

160. Gundevia, Y.D.,: Op.cit.,P.64

161. Gupta, Jyoti Bhushan Dass,:Op.cit.,P.28

162 Bhushan, Vidya,:Op.cit.,P.192

163. *A Study of Communist Movement in Kashmir* A booklet published by Jyoti Prakashan Gaziabad, year not mentioned, P.15

164. C.A. Debate, February 11, 1954.

165. These were, the preamble, Part I (The Union and its territory)Part II (Citizenship), Part III (Fundamental Rights) Preventive Detention; Property Rights, Acquisition of Estates, Power of Issuing Writs, Privileges of State subjects, Articles 54, 55 and 81 (Parliamentary Election) Article 53 (Executive Powers of the Union Part XI Legislative Relations between Union and the State) jurisdiction of Supreme Court.

166. C.A. Debate Volume VIII No. 3 dated February 15, 1954, P.18

167. C.A. Debate Volume XII No. 2 dated October 10, 1956, P.1

168. The Draft Constitution, Clause 3, P.3

169. C.A. Debate, Volume VII, No. 2 dated October 10, 1956, P.10

170. Ibid., P.10

171. The Draft Constitution, Clause 4, P.3

172. Ibid., Clause 11 to 25, P.5 to 8

173. C.A. Debate, Volume XII No.3 dated October 22, 1956.

174. C.A. Debate, Volume XII, No.3 dated October 22, 1956, P.16

175. Ibid
176. The Draft Constituion, Clause 128
177. Ibid., Clause 148 to 158, P.54 - 57
178. C.A. Debate, Volume XII No.2 dated October 10, 1956, P.9
179. Draft Constitution Schedules I to VI P. 58 to 65
180. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) November 12, 1952.
181. ndian Express (New Delhi) July 31, 1956.
182. Assam Tribune (Guhati) September 26, 1956.
183. The Times of India (New Delhi0 September 27, 1956.
184. Ibid
185. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) October 29, 1956.
186. Mail (Madras) October 11, 1956.
187. Dawn (Karachi) October 17, 1956.
188. Bombay Chronicle (Bombay) October 24, 1956.
189. The Times of India (Bombay) October 25, 1956.
190. Dawn (Karachi) October 13, 1956.
191. Bhushan, Vidya,: Op.cit., P.332
192. Jammu and Kashmir Assembly Debate March 3, 1964.
193. The Times of India (New Delhi) May 24, 1964.
194. Financial Express (New Delhi) October 14, 1964.
195. The Indian Express (New Delhi) February 19, 1965.
196. Entry 43 of the Union list deals with the incorporation, regulation etc. of trading corporation, including banking, insurance and financial corporation, but excluding co-operative societies.
197. Entry 78 refers to constitutions and organisation of High Courts.
198. Entries 33 and 34 relate to trade and commerce as well as price control.
199. The Events (New Delhi) January 15, 1965.
200. The Times of India (New Delhi) June 30, 1964.
201. Ibid.
202. Section 148, 149, 150, 151 and 152
203. Sections 30, 51, 95, 126 amended.
204. Sections 27,29, 31, 33 and 100 B
205. The following Central Laws (Labour) were extended to the State:
    1) Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923.
    2) Payment of Wages Act, 1936.
    3) Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.
    4) Factories Act, 1948.
    5) Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946.

206. The following Acts were exteaded to the State for the first time:
    1) Motor Transport Workers Act, 1961.
    2) Minimum Wages Act, 1948.
    3) Payment of Bonus Act, 1965.
    4) Maternity Benefit Act, 1961.
    5) Weekly Holidays Act, 1942.
    6) Employers Liability Act, 1968.
    7) Employment of Children Act, 1938.
    8) Working Journalist (Condition of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1965.
    9) Coal Mines Labour Welfare Fund Act, 1947.
    10) Children (Pledging of Labour) Act, 1963.
    11) Coal Mines Provident Fund and Bonus scheme Act, 1948.
    12) Employees State Insurance Act, 1948.
    13) Employment Exchange (Compulsory Notification of Vacancies) Act, 1959.
207. The Times of India (New Delhi), July 8, 1974.
208. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) June 13, 1972.
209. The Times of India (New Delhi) July 9, 1974.
210. The Patriot (New Delhi) June 16, 1972.
211. The Hindustan times (New Delhi)June 14, 1972.
212. Bhushan, Vidya,: Op.cit., P.337, 338
213. The Motherland (New Delhi) February 25, 1975.
214. The Indian Express (New Delhi) February 24, 1975.
215. The Indian Express (New Delhi) June 11, 1974.
216. The Tribune (Chandigarh) August 3, 1975.
217. The Times of India (New Delhi) August 5, 1976.
218. C.A. Debate, Volume IV No.1 dated August 11, 1952, P.12
219. Ibid. P.13
220. C.A. Debate Volume VIII No.1 dated February 1, 1954, P.6
221. Ibid
222. C.A. Debate Volume VIII No.4, dated February 6, 1954, P.48
223. Raina, Manju,: *Centre State Relations, Irritations and Tensions - A Study of Jammu and Kashmir* (An Unpublished Dissertation, University of Jammu 1989), P.92
224. Khan, G.H,: Op.cit., P.109
225. *Re-Settlement Bill - a Solemn Pledge Redeemed*
    A Pamphlet issued by M.K. Tikoo, Minister of Law and Industries, Jammu and Kashmir State, Srinagar, May 18, 1982, P.5
226. Ibid., P.6
227. Ibid
228. Raina, Manju, Op.cit., P.96

229. Raina, Manju,: Op.cit., P.95
230. Link (New Delhi) October, 1982.
231. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) April 28, 1983.
232. Dev. Batrohi,: *Kashmir Constitutional Aspects* A Pamphlet issued by Jammu and Kashmir Information Department, July 1984, P.5
233. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) June 3, 1983.
234. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) May 22, 1983.
235. The Indian Express (New Delhi) May 22, 1983.
236. Blitz (Bombay) June 25, 1983.
237. Sunday (New Delhi) June 30, 1983.
238. Khidmat (Srinagar)June 10, 1983.
239. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) June 15, 1983.
240. *Window on Press.* A Pamphlet issued by Director of Information, Jammu and Kashmir Government.
241. Sahni, Sati: *Centre - State Relations* New Delhi, Vikas Publishing House, 1984, P.45
242. Ibid
243. Ibid
244. Khidmat (Srinagar) August 20, 1983.
245. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) November 9, 1983.
246. Patriot (New Delhi) November 11, 1983.
247. Dev, Batrohi: *July 1984 Events - Constitutional And Political Aspects* A Pamphlet issued by Information Department, Jammu and Kashmir Government.
248. Ibid.
249. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) July 7, 1984.
250. Raina, Manju,: Op.cit., P.122-123
251. India Today (New Delhi) November 15, 1986, P. 79
252. Ibid
253. *Revamping the Economy* A Pamphlet published by Director of Information Jammu and Kashmir State, 1984, P.2
254. India Today (New Delhi) November 15, 1986, P. 79
255. Talwar, Neena Kumari,; *Eighth Legislative Assembly Elections in Jammu and Kashmir State* M. Phil. Dissertation submitted to the University of Jammu, 1989,P.23
256. Economic and Political Weekly (New Delhi) September 13, 1986.
257. The Kashmir Times (Jammu) March 19, 1987.
258. India Today (New Delhi)November 22, 1986.
259. The Times of India (New Delhi) November 4, 1986.

260. Interview with noted journalist and political columnist Sh. Balraj Puri at his residence on December 10, 1989.

261. Interview with Shri Rishi Kumar Kausal, the State B.J.P. Vice- President at his residence on December, 1989.

262. The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) November 6, 1986.

263. Raina, Manju,: Op.cit

264. Ibid

265. Interview with Ghulam Mohammad, Sheikh Bhadarwahi, Op.cit.

266. Interview with Abdul Razak, Muslim United Front M.L.A. Op. cit.

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters constitute a critical analysis of the 'Party Politics in the State of Jammu & Kashmir - A Case Study of rightist parties'. As a Constituent Unit of the Union of India, Kashmir has held the unique distinction of having a Muslim majority, strategically located, its own struggle for freedom under the banner of National Conference, and a separate Constitution drawn by its own consembly. Based on the Instrument of Accession, the Kashmir's special status has since been crystalised in article 370 of the Indian Constitution. All this has given rise not only to inter-regional conflicts and controversies, irritations and tensions in the state but between the state and the centre also. These circumstances have, thus, offered an opportunity for the study of the role of its rightist parties in the dynamics of Kashmir politics since independence.

A perusal of the pages may be sufficient to state that what has been studied is not merely the evolution of rightist parties in the state and their features but also the religio-politico and socio-economic forces which powerfully influenced their working. Transcending legal formulation and Jargon, an effort has been made to perceive the entire scenario of the rightist party politics in the state as a part of the wider and more fundamental and pervasive nation building process and the political developments in which they have evidently and perhaps necessarily involved.

No society is static and immmunable to laws of social and political development. The history of what now are called the Developed Societies of the West and elsewhere shows that they too have undergone a long evolutionary course of changes which transformed them from medieval phase into unified and modernized nations with well developed constitutional and party systems. It is possible to view all societies as being on an open-ended continum, following the laws of politico-socio-economic development and almost invariably involving the growth of nationalism as a vital factor thereof. The phenomenon has gradually been extended to several countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The growth, the twin processes of national awakening and nation building have been more recently at work in the different societies of Asia and Africa which experienced a long spell of foreign rule.

A developing society such as India, however, offers a typical case of nation-building in a pluralistic background. This is also considerably so in the various constituent units which comprise the country.

On a relatively micro-level, one may observe the pluralistic nature of the society in Jammu and Kashmir and its impact on the Kashmir politics and the particular relationship it has come to form with the Indian Union. Here it seems relevant to point out that the nation building which is increasingly facilitated and prompted by various forces and factors of modernisation and national integration, has, in the very nature of things, to content with the divisive and conflicting diversities prevalent in a pluralistic society. In this connection, the society in Jammu & Kashmir is a sort of miniature of the country as a whole. Pluralism here, as also where, lies principally in the multiplicity of religions, language, races, regional or sub-regional cultures and ethnic make up of the population. The state's strategic location and geographical factors have also impinged on its course of political development. As a matter of fact, it consists of three broad and disparate regions - Jammu, Kashmir valley and Ladakh. These were, however, lumped together through conquest and a process of political assertion by the early Dogra rulers and subjected, over the years, to some degree of political unification under their centralised and autocratic rule.

The model implicit in the present research on the party politics in the State of Jammu & Kashmir State: A Case Study of Rightist Parties' is that of a society in transition - a transition from medieval towards a modern phase. In broader perspective this study reveals the hazards of nation-building in the developing world where plurality of culture, geographical factors and uneven political developments have created strains and stresses in the adjustment of their inter-regional relations as well as the constitutional relation of the state with the Union of India.

The opening Chapter of the present study, however, deals with the importance of the political parties in contemporary democratic world. The political parties which represent not only the dynamics of social life, the means by which classes, regions, ethnic and other groups seek to achieve their objectives, for broad national consensus on the basic issues confronting a nation, give expression to divisions and dissension, conflicts and crisis within the body politic, a method of registering people's grievances and preferences, reduce strains on the system and help in ensuring the stability to the political system, are not only an instrument

of political socialization and participation, but are also vital for the successful prosecution of democracy in the democratic world of today. A modern democratic state without this some what artificial and yet essential unanimity (political parties), would become a brawling chaos of public opinion.

The Chapter entitled "Growth of Party Politics in the State of Jammu & Kashmir and the Social Relevance of political Parties" contains details about the growth of political awakening among the masses of Kashmir from 1846 to 1932 and the emergence of political parties. This period had witnessed the dictatorial and authoritarian rule of the Dogra Maharajas, persecution, imprisonment and externment of sons of the soil who demanded political rights, emergence of an educated elite, because of opening of new Educational Institutions and missionary schools which imparted western type of education, demand for jobs by them, by ousting the outsiders from the Government services, a slogan "Kashmir for Kashmiris', formulation of state subject laws, return of some of the young inhabitants who had joined the Indian Universities for higher education and who had been politically culturised by witnessing freedom movement in British India, the riots of 1931, the appointment of different commissions, representations to the Maharaja by different communities for the redressal of their grievances and ultimately grant of Maharaja's permission for the organisation of political parties in the State.

Before discussing the growth of Rightist Parties, which is a reaction to the national forces in the State, the researcher has tried to highlight the meaning of the terms 'Right' and 'Left' as prevalent in different countries of the world today. The 'Right' in England nowadays is the Conservative Party as it stands for the preservation of British Institutions such as Queen and the Commonwealth, cherishes British traditions, believes in the improvement of the efficiency of the private sector while shielding the less-privileged from expliotation and feels concerned for the middle and upper classes. But the Labour Party is regarded as the party with the left leaning because it advocates rationalisation of means of production, socialistic objectives, abolition of class-differences, equal distribution of the national income, the replacement of social injustice and exploitation by a happier and a more just set of social relationship in the capitalistic system. In the U.S.A. the Democratic Party is branded as the party with left image leaving the title of 'Right' for the Republican Party. In modern France, the left parties are communist and other

socialist parties. The Communist Party is generally a working class party where as Socialist Party is the defender of democratic institutions. The Gaullists, alongwith independents, on the other hand, represent the 'Rightist' forces. The left and the right have a long history in the U.S.S.R. Even at present, there are two strong factions in the Communist Party. Boris Yeltsin represents the leftist faction of the party and criticises Gorbachev for being half-hearted in his approach to many acute problems facing the country. Yegor Ligachev and Chebbriov represent the Right wing of the Communist party as they bitterly oppose the policy of reforms initiated by Comrade Gorbachev.

In the developing world these 'Left' and 'Right' terms have not been used and interpreted by the politicians in the same way as in the West and the Socialist World. The 'Rightist' parties in the developing world, including India, are fundamentalist in their thinking and behaviour, infuse and propogate religious feelings and exploit masses on the basis of religion. The left political parties, on the other hand, are those which support progressive policies and are anti-religious and anti-fundamentalist in their outlook as well as in behaviour and support secularism, democracy and progressive policies, public ownership, equal distribution of economic resources and liquidation of all sorts of exploitation. Thus, the Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference, Plebiscite Front, Awami Action Committee, Jamaat-e-Islami, Praja Parishad, Jan Sangh and Bharatiya Janta Party have been some of the major rightist parties at work on the political scene of the state from time to time during the last sixty years.

"A Study of the Rightist Parties" is another important chapter of this endeavour. With the help of emperical data, it throws a meaningful light on the origin, membership, organisational-structure, ideology and programme, support-base, leadership, finances and electoral performance etc. of the major Rightist Political Parties of the State. It may be pointed out here that there was no organised rightist party in the Ladakh region of the Jammu and Kashmir State. There may be some unorganised splinter groups which too wanted that Ladakh should be a centrally-administered area.

From this analysis it becomes abdundantly clear that there is a clear-cut demarcation between the rightist political parties of Jammu region and those of Kashmir valley in so far as their ideologies, aims and objectives, support-basis and activities are concerned. The Rightist

Parties of Jammu stand for the protection of politico-socio-economic interests of the people of this region and fight against the chauvinistic tendencies of the Muslim majority of the state, particularly from the valley. They believe that their destiny lies in closer ties with the Indian people. The 'Rightist Parties' of the valley, on the other hand, lay stress on safe-guarding the identity and rights of the muslims of the state. They also want effective checks against the onslaughts of secular forces represented by India. They are so strongly mobilized and instigated against chauvinistic tendencies of the Indian nationalism that they even advocate secession from the Indian Union. They also preach Muslim fundamentalism and make free use of Mosques for their activities. Whereas the 'Rightist Parties' of Jammu have their strong-holds in the Hindu dominated belts of Jammu region, their counter parts in the valley bank on the support of Muslims of Kashmir as well as the Muslim-dominated belts of the Jammu region. The 'Rightist Parties' in Jammu raise their funds from the membership fee as well as, from donations received from their patrons. But the rightist parties of the valley in addition to their internal resources, have been reportedly receiving huge funds in the shape of petro-dollars from the Gulf Countries in the name of spreading Islamic culture. The 'Rightist Parties' in both the regions, however, differ in their organisational structures to a large extent.

"Role of the Rightist Parties both inside and outside the Legislature" may perhaps aptly be described as a key chapter of this study because without taking an adequate account of the critical role played by its 'Rightist parties' no real academic pursuit to analyse or evaluate the dynamics of Kashmir politics of today can be possible. Their role have been studied in the light of major political issues which were not only confronted by the people of Kashmir from time to time since independence but also have created irritations, tensions, conflicts, confrontations and political turmoils in the different regions of the state as well as between the State and the Centre.

The popular sentiments of Dogras in Jammu region, believing the Hindu Maharaja to be the symbol of their security against the majority population of Kashmir region, linked their fate and security with him and sided with him in his attempt to retain more and more powers in pre-independence period. It seemed to them that the prospect of democracy would be nothing more than being exposed to the whims of a permanent majority of Kashmiri Muslims and their leadership. They, thus opposed

the very basis of Kashmir's struggle for freedom. Moreover, the open condemnation of Dogra rulers by the Kashmiri Nationalists, not only created but hardened their distrust against the Kashmiri leadership. They, therefore, opposed every political move from the valley without evaluating its plus and minus points and played a negative role throughout the period of struggle for freedom in the Kashmir State.

In order to have a greater security against the Maharaja's arbitrary authority, the Kashmiri nationalists in general and Kashmiri Muslims in particular, struggled for the establishment of a responsible government in the state. They perceived their security only in democracy which among other attributes, meant a majority rule.

However, the post-independence politics of Jammu witnessed both inter-regional and intra-regional conflicts. Believing in the fact that security lies with Indian Union, the Dogras of Jammu demanded more close ties with the Indian Union. They pleaded for transfer of more and more powers from Kashmir to Delhi rather than from Delhi to Kashmir.

But due to their minority status as against Hindu majority, the Kashmiri nationalist, on the other hand, followed the policy of retaining the maximum autonomy and stood for limited accession of the state with the Indian Union.

The divergent positions taken by the Dogras of Jammu and the people in the valley have also been, reflected in the attitudes and policies pursued by the 'Rightist Parties' of these two regions of the State towards the major political issues confronted by the people from time to time, particulary since 1947.

The 'Rightist parties' of Jammu, therefore, not only opposed the limited accession of the state with the Union of India but stressed that it would be unconditional, full and final and not be linked with the promise of a Plebiscite. They strongly objected to the incorporation of Article 370 in the Constitution of India, convening of Kashmir's consembly to draft a separate constitution for the state, the haphazard manner in which the land reforms programme was taken up, abolition of monarchy and election of Dr. Karan Singh as first Sadar-i-Riyast, a separate flag and emblem for the state, Delhi Agreement of 1952, the adoption of Kashmir's Constitution of 1957, Indira-Sheikh Accord of 1975 and return of Sheikh Abdullah to power again, Resettlement Bill, and Rajiv-Farooq Accord of 1986. They believed that all above-mentioned endeavours

would take the state further away from the centre and would not only demoralise the patriotic and integrationist forces but also encourage separatists, autonomists as well as secessionist-forces in the State. These parties, however, welcomed the arrest of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah in August 1953, extension of more central laws to the state, the change of nomenclature of Prime Minister and Sadar-i-Riyast into Chief Minister and Governor, dismissal of Dr. Farooq Abdullah's ministry in 1984 and Mr. G.M. Shah's ministry in March 1986. Perhaps they believed that these measures would further reduce the gulf between the state and the centre.

The 'Rightist Parties' in the valley, however, strongly contested the accession of the state with the centre and stressed that this issue was still alive and could only be decided by the people of the state through the free exercise of the right of self-determination in a Plebiscite. Some of them even blamed Sheikh Abdullah for linking the fate of Kashmir with India for his own petty personal interests. As they refused to recognise the state's accession to India, the Article 370 of the Constitution of India granting special status to Kashmir was irrelevant to them. They strongly opposed the setting up of the state constituent assembly because it would deprive the people of Kashmir of their right of self-determination and the election of Dr. Karan Singh as Sadar-i-Riyast (first head of the state). They also opposed the arrest of Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah and regarded it as a coup and the first act of the murder of democracy. The Kashmir Constitution of 1957 thrust on them by the fascist clique represented by Bakshi Gulam Mohammad, was totally unacceptable to them. The extension of central laws, the change of nomenclature of Sadar-i-Riyast and Prime Minister, the merger of National Conference into Congress(I) and ouster of Dr. Farooq Abdullah ministry, the dismissal of G.M. Shah ministry, the imposition of Governor's rule and finally Rajiv-Farooq Accord did not find any favour with these parties. They, not only branded Rajiv-Farooq Accord as a friendship between a "Kafir" and a Muslim but also described it as a 'division of spoils'. They, however, welcomed land reforms, abolition of monarchy, (as it was a relic of the fedual system-based on exploitation and against the aspirations of the Kashmiris) and adoption of a separate flag and emblem for the state(as these symbolised the success of Kashmir's struggle against the century old Dogra autocratic rule). They believed that Delhi Agreement was a step towards the further confirmation of maximum state autonomy. They welcomed Indira-Sheikh Accord of 1975 and

return of Sheikh Abdullah to power again, and also the Resettlement Bill because of human values involved in it.

We may perhaps be justified in concluding this study by saying that the 'Rightist Political Parties' in Jammu region and their counterparts in the valley followed quite opposite directions due to their respective constraints, considerations and compulsions, both, in one way or the other, impending the nation-building process in the state of Jammu and Kashmir. One of the serious impacts of this prevalent phenomenon is that the story of Kashmirs' Constitutional relationship with India is still an incomplete story of adjustment of respective sphere of power between federal polity and a Constituent unit. The study, thus reveals the hazards of nation-building in the developing world where plurality of religion, culture, geographical factors etc. have created strains and stresses in the adjustment of inter-regional as well as intra-regional constitutional relationship.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jammu and Kashmir Constituent Assembly Debates

C.A. Deb; Volume I, No. 1.

— ; Volume II, No. 5.

— ; Volume III, No. 1.

— ; Volume III, No. 2.

— ; Volume III, No. 3.

— ; Volume IV, No.4.

— ; Volume IV, No. 6.

— ; Volume V, No. 2.

— ; Volume VII, No. 2.

— ; Volume VIII, No. 1.

— ; Volume VII, No. 3.

— ; Volume VII, No. 4.

— ; Volume XII, No. 2.

— ; Volume XII, No. 3.

Constitutions

Constitution of India.

Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir.

Party Constitutions

Constitution of All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference.

Constitution of Praja Parishad.

Constitution of Jan Sangh.

Constitution of B.J.P.

Constitution of Jammat-e-Islami.

Correspondence

'Sheikh Abdullah - Sadiq Correspondence, August to October 1956.' Published by Mridula Sarabhai, B1/48 Chanakya Puri, New Delhi.

Unpublished M. Phil. Dissertations

Raina, Manju : State Relations, Irritations and Tensions - A Study of Jammu and Kashmir, University of Jammu 1989.

Talwar, Neena Kumari : Eighth Legislative Election in Jammu and Kashmir State, University of Jammu, 1989.

Press Notes

Press Note issued by the Jammu and Kashmir Government on February 9, 1952

Resolutions

'Constituent Assembly for Jammu and Kashmir' Resolution adopted by the General Council of All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference on October 27, 1951.

Jammu and Kashmir Gazette

Jammu and Kashmir Gazette Extraordinary dated Ist May 1951, Jammu and Kashmir Archives Department, Record Office, Old Secretariat, Jammu.

Books

Andrew, William : *Soviet Institutions and Policies - InsideView,* D. Van Nostrand Company New Jersesy U.S.A., 1966.

Aggarwal, R.C. : *Indian Government and Plitics,* S. Chand and Co., New Delhi, 1986.

Anand, Adarsh : *The Development of Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir* Light and Life Publishers, New Delhi, 1980.

Asthana, Pushpa : *Party System in India - Development and Decay,* Criterion Publication, New Delhi, 1988.

Almond, Gabriel : *Comparative Politics,* Amerind Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1969.

Bushan, Vidya : *State Politics and Government,* Jay Kay Book House, Jammu, 1985.

Bird Wood, Lord : *Two Nations and Kashmir,* R. Hale & Co., London, 1956.

Bomzai, P.N.K. :*A History of Kashmir,* Metropolitan Book Co., Delhi 1962.

Bomzai, P.N.K. :*States of Our Union - Jammu and Kashmir,* Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, New Delhi, 1973

Bazaz, P.N. : *Inside Kashmir,* Kashmir Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1941

Bazaz, P.N. : *Struggle for Freedom in Kashmir,* Kashmir Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1954.

Birch, A.H. : *British System of Government,* Minerva Series of Student Hand Book, London, 1982.

Bone, Hugh : *American Politics and Party System,* MacGraw Hill Book Co., New York, 1965.

Bond, Jean : *The Government of France,* Methuen and Company, London, 1974.

Bazaz, P.N. : *Democracy Through Intimidation and Terror,* Heritage Publishers, New Delhi, 1978.

Castles, E.G. : *The Impact of Politics,* Sage Publications London, 1982.

Curtis, Michael : *Comparative Government and Politics,* Harper & Raw Publishers, 1978.

Carter, Gwendolen : *The Government of France,* Harcourt Brace Jovanowich, New York, 1972.

Chaig Baxter : *Jan Sangh,* University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 1969.

Duverger, Maurice : *Political Parties,* Metheun & Co. Ltd., London, 1964.

Drew, Fredrick : *The Jammu and Kashmir Territories,* Oriental Publishers, New Delhi, 1971.

Dragnich, Alex : *Major European Governments,* The Dorsey Press, Illinois, 1970.

Dass, Hari Hara, Dass Sasmita : *Indian Government and Politics,* Sangita Printers, New Delhi, 1958.

Dass, Durga : *Sardar Patel's Correspondence,* Navjeevan Publications, New Delhi, 1953.

Elderveld, S.J. : *Political Parties,* A Behavioural Analysis Chicago, 1964.

Engineer, Asghar Ali : *Islam And Muslim - A Critical Assessment,* Printwell Publications Jaipur, 1985.

Fazili, Manzoor : *Kashmir Government and Politics,* Gullshan Publishers, Srinagar, 1982.

Gupta Jyoti, Bhushan Dass : *Jammu and Kashmir,* Martinus/Nijhoff/The Haque, 1960.

Gupta, Sisir : *A Study of India - Pakistan Relations,* Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1966.

Granston : *The New Left,* Badly Head, London, 1970.

Gokhle, B.K. : *A Study of Political Theory,* Himalayan Publishing House, Bombay, 1979.

Ganai, Abdul Jabbar : *Kashmir National Conference and Politics,* Gulshan Publishers Srinagar, 1984.

Gundevia, Y.D. : *The Testament of Sheikh Abdullah,* Palit and Palit Publishers, Dehra Dun, 1974.

Hinderson, C.G. : *Introduction of Political Parties,* Row & Row, New York, 1976.

Husband, Young Frances : *Northern Frontier of Kashmir,* Macmillan India, New Delhi, 1973.

Jchri, J.C. : *Indian Government and Politics,* Vishal Publishers, Delhi, 1985.

Khan, G.H. : *Freedom Movement in Kashmir,* Light & Life Publishers, New Delhi, 1980.

Khan, G.H. : *Government And Politics of Jammu and Kashmir,* Published by Miss Natasha, Rawalpora, Srinagar, 1988

Kak, B.L. : *Kashmir Problem and Politics,* Seema Publishers Delhi, 1981.

Knight, E.F. : *Where Three Empires Meet,* Longman, Green and Co., 1893.

Kalin, Akhtar : *Sher-i-Kashmir, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah Tehrik-i-Huriyat-i-Kashmir Ke Aive Mein,* Suidi Sagar Academy, Lahore, 1968.

Krogh, Kenneth : *Political Thought Since World War II,* Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1964.

Karbel, Josef : *Danger in Kashmir,* Princeton University Press, London, 1954.

Lawrence, Waltee : The India We Served, Cassel & Co., London, 1928.

Lawson, Kay : *The Comparative Study of Political Parties,* St. Martins Press, New York, 1976.

Lamb, Alastiar : *Crisis in Kashmir,* Routledge and Kagan Paul, London, 1966.

Laski, H.J. : (i) *A Grammer of Politics,* George Allen & Unwin, London, 1977. (ii) *Parliamentary Government in England,* Oxford University Press, London, 1967.

Madhok, Balraj : *Bungling in Kashmir,* Hind Pocket Books, Delhi, 1974.

1978.

Madhok, Balraj : *Kashmir: Centre of New Alignments,* Deepak Prakashan, New Delhi, 1963.

Mohi-ud-Din Iqbal : Political Geography of India, Adam Publishers, New Delhi, 1987.

Mishra, B.B. : *The Indian Political Parties,* Oxford University Press, 1976.

Merle, Fainsod : *How Russia is Ruled ?,* Harvard University Press, 1963.

Munro, D.J. : *The Government of United States,* Metheun & Co. Ltd., London, 1964.

Maisel, Louis : *Political Parties : Development or Decay,* Sage Publication, London, 1977.

Moorcrof, William : *Travels in the Himalayan Province of Hindustan and the Punjab,* John Murrey, London, 1841

Mc, Hennery Dean : *Elements of American Government,* MacGrow Hill Book Co., New York, 1962.

Malik, B.N. : *My Years with Nehru,* Allied Publishers New Delhi, 1971.

Menon, V.P. : *The Story of Integration of Indian States,* Orient Longman, New Delhi, 1969.

Mahajan, Mehar Chand : *Looking Back,* Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963.

Nayyar, Kuldip : *Distant Neighbours,* Vikas Publications, New Delhi, 1972.

Narang, A.S. : *Indian Government and Politics,* Gitanjli Publishing House, New Delhi, 1987.

Naagis, Nar Singh Dass : *Tarik Jadid Dogra Desh,* Chand Publishing House, Jammu, 1967.

Philips, C.H., Wain Wright : *The Partition of India - Politics and Prospective,* George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1970.

Panikar, K.M. : *The Founding of Kashmir State,* George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1953.

Penniman, Howard : *The American Political Process,* D. Van Nostrand Company Princeton, New Jearsey, 1962.

Pickles, Dorothy : *The Fifth French Republic,* B.I. Publications, Delhi, 1978.

Puri, Geeta : *Bharatiya Jan Sangh,* Janta, New Delhi, 1980.

Puri, Balraj : *Jammu - A Clue to Kashmir Tangle,* Photo Flesh Press, New Delhi, 1966.

Qureshi, Z.M. : Elections and State Politics of India, Sandeep Prakashan, New Delhi, 1979.

Rose, Richard : *The Problems of Party Government,* Row & Row, New York, 1976.

Robertson, David : *The Theory of Party Competition,* George Allen & Unwin, London, 1976.

Rodee Anderson : *Introduction to Political Science,* Christol Greene, New Delhi, 1977.

Raman, Sundar : *Indian Government and Politics,* Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 1988.

Smith, W.C. : *Modern Islam in India,* Usha Publications, New Delhi, 1979.

Singh, Balbir : *State Politics in India,* Macmillan India, Delhi, 1982.

Sartori, Glovanni : *Parties and Party System,* Cambridge University Press, London, 1976.

Saraf, Yusaf : *Kashmir Fight for Freedom,* Frozeson, Lahore, 1977.

Teng, Mohan Krishan : *Kashmir's Special Status,* Oriental Publishers, Delhi, 1975.

Teng, Koul : *Constitutional History and Documents,* Light & Life Publishers, New York, 1977.

Tyndale, Biscoe : *Kashmir in Sunlight and Shade,* Seeley Service & Co., London, 1922.

Tikoo, P.N. : *History of Kashmir,* Light and Life Publishers, New Delhi, 1979.

Taser, Rasheed : *Tehrik-e-Harriat-e-Kashmir,* Muhafiz Publishers, Srinagar, 1968.

Tiwari, Uman Kant : *The Making of the Indian Constitution,* Central Book Depot, Allahabad, 1969.

Weiner, M.La. Palombora : *Political Parties and Political Development,* Princeton University Press, U.S.A., 1972.

Ware, Allen : *The Logic of Party Democracy,* Macmillan, London, 1979.

Walter, Langueur : *A Dictionary of Politics,* Oxford University Press, 1964.

Pamphlets

'Jammu and Kashmir' a Pamphlet published by Publication Division of Information and Broadcasting Ministry, Government of India, 1973.

'Kashmir' Issued by General Secretary, All India State People's Conference, Bombay, 1939.

'Jammu and Kashmir Government' A Hand-Book of Jammu and Kashmir State, Ranbir Govt. Press, Jammu, 1947.

'Jammu Rejects a Separate Constitution' Published by All J&K Praja Parishad

'Towards Solnency' Published by the Govt. of J&K 1952.

'Programme' A Pamphlet published by All J&K Praja Parishad, Janta Printing Press, Jammu, 1951.

'Searchlight on Jammu Agitation' Issued by the Information Officer, Kashmir Bureau of Information, New Delhi, Year not mentioned.

'The Flag Issue' Issued by the Kashmir Bureau Information, New Delhi, Year not mentioned.

'Kashmir's Special Status'. Issued by All J&K National Conference, Mujahid Manzil Srinagar, year not mentioned.

'Nehru - Abdullah Pact' Issued by Praja Parishad. Year not mentioned

'Doda District' Published by Abdul Ghani Goni, dated July 24, 1953.

'J&K Chronical' A Magazine published from Jammu, February 1976.

'Re-settlement Bill' - A Solemn Pledge Redeemed Issued by Jammu & Kashmir Government, 1982.

'Kashmir Constitutional Aspects' A Pamphlet issued by Dev Batrohi for J&K Govt. Information Department.

'Window on Press' A Pamphlet issued by Director of Information J&K Government.

July 1984 Events - Constitutional and Political Aspects

Issued by Dev, Batrohi for Information Department, J&K Government.

'Revamping the Economy' Issued by Director of Information, J&K Government Srinagar, 1984.

Newspaper, Weeklies and Fortnightlies

Time (New York), April 10, 1989.

Times of India (New Delhi), September 25, 1989.

Time (New York), January 1, 1990.

The Statesman (New Delhi), June 11, 1947.

The Hamdard (Srinagar), February 15, 1936.

The Hamdard (Srinagar), January 23, 1937.

The Indian Express (New Delhi), April 9, 1987.

Jammu Panorama (Jammu), June 1987.

The Kashmir Times (Jammu), February 14, 1987.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu), March 5, 1987.
The Daily Excelsior (Jammu), February 20, 1987.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu) August 1, 1989.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu), August 1, 1989.
The Times of India (New Delhi), September 22, 1989.
The Times of India (New Delhi), February 1, 1958.
The Tribune (Ambala), October 21, 1965.
The Tribune (Ambala), October 4, 1967.
The Statesman (Delhi), December 28, 1966.
National Herald (New Delhi), March 26, 1972.
Hindustan Times (New Delhi), March 18, 1972.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu), September 10, 1989.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu), December 3, 1989.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu) October 22, 1989.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), November 12, 1951
The Tribune (Ambala), March 22, 1952.
The Times of India (Bombay), September 11, 1951.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), December 18, 1950.
The Tribune (Ambala), April 2, 1957.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), September 26, 1989.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), November 12, 1951.
The Tribune (Ambala), January 17, 1952.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), December 7. 1952.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu), September 10, 1989.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu), September 22, 1989.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), November 12, 1951,
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), September 26, 1989.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), March 14, 1990.

The Kashmir Times (Jammu), December 3, 1989.
The Hindu (Madras), June 26, 1949.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), December 18, 1950.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), November 11, 1951.
Dawn (Karachi), November 1, 1950.
The Hindu (Madras), October 10, 1952.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), November 12, 1951.
Front (Srinagar), June 11, 1957.
The Statesman (New Delhi), November 15, 1952.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi) November 12, 1952.
The Statesman (Calcutta), August 14, 1952.
The Tribune (Ambala), February 4, 1952.
The Times of India (Bombay), July 10, 1952.
Amrit Bazar Patrika (Calcutta), July 14, 1952.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), April 9, 1952.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), April 10, 1952.
National Herald (New Delhi), April 13, 1952.
The Statesman (New Delhi), April 12, 1952.
The Statesman (New Delhi), July 18, 1952.
The Times of India (New Delhi), July 25, 1952.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), September 9, 1952.
The Organiser (New Delhi), October 27, 1952.
The Hindustan Standard (New Delhi), November 15, 1952.
Vigil (Delhi), February 13, 1953.
Kashmir Affairs (New Delhi), January 3, 1960.
The Times of India (Bombay), August 10, 1953.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), November 12, 1952.
The Indian Express (New Delhi), July 31, 1956.
The Times of India (New Delhi), September 27, 1956.

The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), October 29, 1956.
Mail (Madras), October 11, 1956.
Bombay Chronicals (Bombay), October 24, 1956.
The Times of India (Bombay), October 25, 1956.
The Times of India (New Delhi), May 24, 1964.
Financial Express (New Delhi), October 14, 1964.
The Events (New Delhi), January 15, 1965.
The Times of India (New Delhi), June 30, 1964.
The Times of India (New Delhi), July 8, 1972.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), June 13, 1972.
The Times of India (New Delhi), July 9, 1974.
The Patriot (New Delhi), June 16, 1972.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), June 14, 1972.
The Indian Express (New Delhi), February 24, 1975.
The Motherland (New Delhi), February 25, 1975.
The Tribune (Chandigarh), August 3, 1975.
The Times of India (New Delhi), August 5, 1976.
Link (New Delhi), October 1982.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), April 28, 1983.
The Kashmir Times (Jammu), June 3, 1983.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), May 22, 1983.
The Indian Express (New Delhi), May 22, 1983.
Blitz (Bombay), June 25, 1983.
Sunday (New Delhi), June 30, 1983.
Khidmat (Srinagar), June 10, 1983.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), June 15, 1983.
Khidmat (Srinagar) August 20, 1983.
The Hindustan Times (New Delhi), November 9, 1983.
Patriot (New Delhi), November 11, 1983.

The Kashmir Times (Jammu), July 7, 1984.

India Today (New Delhi), November 15, 1986.

Economic and Political Weekly (New Delhi), September 13, 1986.

The Kashmir Times (Jammu), March 19, 1987.

India Today (New Delhi), November 22, 1986.

The Times of India (New Delhi), November 4, 1986.

Articles

Crucial Choice Confronts Jammat-e-Islami, By Om Saraf in the Kashmir Times (Jammu) July 4, 1989.

Visit to Kashmir, By Frank Moraes in the Times of India (Bombay) February 1957.

Where do we go from here, By Kuldip Nayyar in the Kashmir Times, January 19, 1990.

The Muslim United Front, By P.S. Verma in the Book 'Political Parties in India by S. Bhatnagar and Pradip Kumar, New Delhi, 1988.

Land Reforms in Jammu and Kashmir, By Meenakashi Moza in 'Vitasa' (Calcutta), 1981.